arXiv:1506.06333v2 [math.SG] 30 Jun 2015

THE EXPONENTIAL DECAY OF GLUING MAPS AND GROMOV-WITTEN INVARIANTS

AN-MIN LI AND LI SHENG

ABSTRACT. We prove the exponential decay of the derivative of the gluing maps with respect to the gluing parameter, therefore the Gromov-Witten invariants can be defined as an integral over top strata of virtual neighborhood.

1. **Introduction**

In the early 90's, Ruan [14] introduced a new invariant to the symplectic manifold by counting J-holomorphic maps from S^2 to a fixed *semi-positive* symplectic manifold. Ruan called his invariant *Donaldson type invariant* because he was modeling his invariant on Donaldson invariants. Later Ruan and Tian [17] [18] studied the higher genus case and proved the associativity for the quantum cup product and the WDVV equations. Ruan's invariant immediately captured attention from a large community of mathematician and was renamed as Gromov-Ruan invariant [6], [7] or Gromov-Ruan-Witten invariant [20]. In the subsequent year the invariant became commonly known as Gromov-Witten invariant.

Let (M,ω) be a compact symplectic manifold. We choose a ω-tame almost complex structure $J : TM \to TM$ and fix a homology class $A \in H_2(M,\mathbb{Z})$. Let $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(M,g,m)$ be the compactified moduli space of stable J- holomorphic maps into M of homology class A from Riemann surfaces of genus g with m marked points. One can define a topology on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(M,g,m)$. It is well-known that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(M,g,m)$ is a compact Hausdorff space.

Ruan's original definition is a geometric counting of J-holomorphic maps weighted by the order of their automorphisms. It has the advantage of being rational numbers. However, his construction only works for so-called *semi-positive* symplectic manifold. In the effort to remove semi-positive condition, the technology went on a significant change. For example, the latter approach focuses on the existence of the fundamental class. There had been several different approaches to define Gromov-Witten Invariants for general symplectic manifolds, such as Fukaya-Ono [8], Li-Tian [11], Liu-Tian [12], Ruan [15], Siebert [19] and etc. Since then, almost twenty year has passed. Recently, there is a great deal of interest among symplectic geometric community to re-visit the latter approach with the purpose to clean up some of issues. This is where we feel that this article can make some contributions.

Let's describe our technique. Classically, one way to treat fundamental class of an oriented differential manifold is to use differential form and its integration. The moduli space is not smooth. However, it can be embedded at least locally into a smooth manifold called *virtual neighborhood*. Therefore, the differential form technique can still be applied. The main complication is that the

---

partially supported by a NSFC grant.

moduli space has various lower strata. How to deal with these lower strata is one of main issues discussed recently. Our main idea is that if we can show that the relevant differential form decays in certain rate near lower strata, the Gromov-Witten invariants can be defined as an integral over top strata of virtual neighborhood. Therefore, all the complication near lower strata of the moduli space can be avoided entirely. This technique was first invented by Li-Ruan in the relative theory setting. In [10] the estimates is of order r^{-2} where $r \to \infty$ is certain gluing parameter. In this paper we improve it to the order of exponential decay.

When the transversality fails we need to take the stabilization (we use the terminology ”regularization” in this paper) and study the perturbed J-holomorphic map (κ, u), which satisfies

$$\bar{\partial}_J u + \kappa = 0$$

and $D\mathcal{S}_u := D_u + \kappa : K_u \times W^{1,p} \to L^p$ is surjective, where $K_u \subset \mathcal{E}|_u$ is a finite dimensional subspace. By a standard regularization procedure (see [16, 4, 3, 10]) we get a finite dimensional virtual orbifold system

$$\{(U_I, E_I, \sigma_I) | I \subset \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}\}$$

indexed by a partially ordered set $(I = 2^{\{1,2,\cdots,n\}}, \subset)$. Let $\Lambda = \{\Lambda_I\}$ be a partition of unity and $\{\Theta_I\}$ be a virtual Euler form of $\{E_I\}$ such that $\Lambda_I \Theta_I$ is compactly supported in $U_{I,\epsilon}$. The Gromov-Witten invariants can be defined as

$$\Psi_{A,g,m}(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_m) = \sum_I \int_{U_{I,\epsilon}} \prod_i e_i^* \alpha_i \wedge \Lambda_I \Theta_I \tag{1}$$

for $\alpha_i \in H^*(M, \mathbb{R})$ represented by differential form, where e_i is the evaluation map.

It is proved that these integrals are independent of the choices of Θ_I and the regularization (see [4]), if they exist. The key issue is the convergence of the integrals near each lower strata.

We use the gluing argument. Let $b = (u_1, u_2; \Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2, j_1, j_2)$, where (Σ_1, j_1) and (Σ_2, j_2) are smooth Riemann surfaces of genus g_1 and g_2 joining at q and $u_i : \Sigma_i \to M$ are J-holomorphic with $u_1(q) = u_2(q)$. We use the holomorphic cylindrical coordinates (s_i, t_i) near q. In terms of the holomorphic cylindrical coordinates we write

$$\Sigma_1 - \{q\} = \Sigma_{10} \bigcup \{[0, \infty) \times S^1\},$$

$$\Sigma_2 - \{q\} = \Sigma_{20} \bigcup \{(-\infty, 0] \times S^1\}.$$

Over each tube the linearized operator D_u takes the following form

$$D_u = \frac{\partial}{\partial s} + J_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + S, \tag{2}$$

where $\left| \frac{\partial^{k+l}}{\partial s^k \partial t^l} S \right| \to 0$, exponentially and uniformly in t as $s \to \infty$. To recover a Fredholm theory we use weighted function spaces $W^{1,p,\alpha}(u^*TM)$.

For any gluing parameter $(r) := (r, \tau)$ we construct a surface $\Sigma_{(r)} = \Sigma_1 \#_{(r)} \Sigma_2$. Then we glue the map (u_1, u_2) to get the pregluing maps $u_{(r)}$, a family of approximate J-holomorphic maps. Denote by $Q_b : L^{p,\alpha} \to K_b \times W^{1,p,\alpha}$ a right inverse of $D\mathcal{S}_b$. Then $D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$ is surjective for r large enough.

Moreover, there is a right inverses $Q_{b_{(r)}}$. By implicit function theorem, there exists a small open set O of $0 \in Ker\ D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$ and a unique smooth map

$$f_{(r)} : O \to L_r^{p,\alpha}(u_{(r)}^* TM \otimes \wedge^{0,1})$$

such that for any $(k, \xi) \in O$

$$\bar{\partial}_J \exp_{u_{(r)}}(h) + P_{u_{(r)},v}\kappa = 0,$$

where

$$(\kappa, h) = (k, \xi) + Q_{b_{(r)}} \circ f_{(r)}(k, \xi).$$

Put

$$E_1 := KerD\mathcal{S}_{u_1}, \;\; E_2 := KerD\mathcal{S}_{u_2}, \quad \mathbb{H} = T_qM,$$

Denote

$$KerD\mathcal{S}_b := E_1 \bigoplus_{\mathbb{H}} E_2.$$

We can prove that when r large enough there is an isomorphism

$$I_r : KerD\mathcal{S}_b \longrightarrow KerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}.$$

From $I_r(\kappa, \zeta) + Q_{b_{(r)}} \circ f_{(r)} \circ I_r(\kappa, \zeta)$ we get a gluing map from $O_{j_1} \times O_{j_2} \times O$ into the moduli space, where O is a neighborhood of 0 in $KerD\mathcal{S}_b$, O_{j_k} is a neighborhood of j_k, $k = 1, 2$. Then $((j_1, j_2), r, \tau)$ is a local coordinate system in Delingne-Mumford space. We may choose $((j_1, j_2), r, \tau, \kappa, \zeta)$ as a local coordinate system in the moduli space. A important estimate in this paper is the following

Theorem 1.1. *Let $l \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ be a fixed integer. There exists positive constants $\mathcal{C}, \hbar, R_0$ and $\alpha < \frac{1}{16e^4}$ such that for any $(\kappa, \zeta) \in KerD\mathcal{S}_b$ with $\|(\kappa, \zeta)\| < \hbar$ the following estimates hold*

[1] $$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \Big(I_r(\kappa, \zeta) + Q_{b_{(r)}} \circ f_{(r)} \circ I_r(\kappa, \zeta) \Big) \right\|_{1,p,\alpha,r} \leq \mathcal{C} e^{-\alpha \frac{lr}{8}}.$$

[2] *Restricting to the compact set $\{|s_i| \leq R_0\}$, we have*

$$\left| \pi_2' \circ \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \Big(I_r(\kappa, \zeta) + Q_{b_{(r)}} \circ f_{(r)} \circ I_r(\kappa, \zeta) \Big) \right| \leq \mathcal{C} e^{-\alpha \frac{lr}{8}},$$

where $\pi_2'(\kappa, h) := h$ for any $(\kappa, h) \in K_{b_{(r)}} \times \mathcal{W}_r^{1,p,\alpha}(\Sigma_{(r)}; u_{(r)}^* TM)$.

For the definition of $\| \cdot \|$ and $\| \cdot \|_{1,p,\alpha,r}$ see (33) *and* (34).

Corollary 1.2. *Let (κ, ζ) be as in Theorem 1.1, denote*

$$I_r(\kappa, \zeta) + Q_{b(r)} \circ f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa, \zeta)) = (\kappa_r, h_{(r)}).$$

Then, restricting to the compact set $\{|s_i| \leq R_0\}$, we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \exp_{u_{(r)}} h_{(r)} \right| \leq \mathcal{C} e^{-\alpha \frac{lr}{8}}. \tag{3}$$

We use these estimates to show the convergence of the integrals (1).

2. **Preliminary**

2.1. **Fundamental concepts.** We recall some fundamental concepts in symplectic geometry (see [MS]). Let (M,ω) be a symplectic manifold. An almost complex structure $J: TM \to TM$ is called ω-tame if

$$v \neq 0 \Longrightarrow \omega(v, Jv) > 0$$

for every $v \in TM$. It is called ω-compatible if it is ω-tame and

$$\omega(Jv, Jw) = \omega(v, w)$$

for every $x \in M$ and $v, w \in T_xM$. Every ω-tame almost complex structure J determine a Riemannian metric

$$g_J(v,w) :=< v, w >_J:= \frac{1}{2}\left(\omega(v, Jw) + \omega(w, Jv)\right). \tag{4}$$

Let (M,ω,J) be a closed symplectic manifold of dimension $2n$ with ω-tame almost complex structure. Let (Σ, j) be a closed Riemann surface. A map $u: \Sigma \longrightarrow M$ is called a (J,j)-holomorphic map if $du \circ j = J \circ du$. Alternatively

$$\overline{\partial}_J u = \frac{1}{2}(du + J \circ du \circ j) = 0.$$

We will omit j and call u "J-holomorphic map" later to simplify notations. Since Σ is closed, $[u(\Sigma)] \in H_2(M,\mathbb{Z})$.

Denote by $\mathcal{B}$ the space of $W^{1,p}$-maps $u: \Sigma \longrightarrow M$ with a fixed homology class $A \in H_2(M,\mathbb{Z})$, that is

$$\mathcal{B} = \{u \in W^{1,p}(\Sigma, M)|\ u_\star([\Sigma]) = A\},$$

where p is an even integer greater than 2. Then $\mathcal{B}$ is an infinite dimensional Banach manifold. For any $u \in \mathcal{B}$, the tangent space at u, $T_u\mathcal{B} = W^{1,p}(\Sigma, u^\star TM)$.

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the infinite dimensional Bananch bundle over $\mathcal{B}$ whose fiber at u is $L^p(\Sigma, u^\star TM \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \wedge^{0,1}T^\star\Sigma)$, the space of L^p-section of the bundle $u^\star TM \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \wedge^{0,1}T^\star\Sigma$. The Cauchy-Riemann operator defines a smooth Fredholm section $\overline{\partial}_J: \mathcal{B} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}$. The zero set of this section

$$\mathcal{M} = \overline{\partial}_J^{-1}(0) \subset \mathcal{B}$$

is the moduli space.

The energy of a smooth map $u: \Sigma \longrightarrow M$ is defined as the L^2-norm of the 1-form $du \in \Omega^1(\Sigma, u^* TM)$:

$$E(u) := \frac{1}{2}\int_\Sigma |du|_J^2 dvol_\Sigma.$$

Note that the energy density $|du|_J^2$ depends on the metric on Σ. It is important that the energy of a J-holomorphic map is a topological invariant that depends only on the homology class $u_\star([\Sigma])$:

$$E(u) = \int_\Sigma u^*\omega.$$

In this paper we need the following theorem of exponential decay in [13] and the implicit function theorem (see [13],[21]):

Theorem 2.1. *Fix a constant $\mathfrak{c} \in (0,1)$. There are two positive constant $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\hbar_0$ depending only on J, ω and $\mathfrak{c}$ such that for any J-holomorphic map $u : [-R, R] \times S^1 \to M$ with*

$$E(u, -R \leq s \leq R) < \hbar_0, \tag{5}$$

we have

$$E(u, -B \leq s \leq B) \leq \mathcal{C}_1 e^{-2\mathfrak{c}(R-B)}, \qquad \forall\, 0 \leq B \leq R, \tag{6}$$

$$|\nabla u|(s,t) \leq \mathcal{C}_1 e^{-\mathfrak{c}(R-|s|)}, \qquad \forall\, |s| \leq R-1, \tag{7}$$

Theorem 2.2. *Let $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ and $(Y, \|\cdot\|_Y)$ be Banach spaces, $U \subset X$ be an open set and $F : X \to U$ be a continuously differentiable map. Let $x_0 \in U$ be such that $D := dF(x_0) : X \longrightarrow Y$ is surjective and has a bounded linear right inverse $Q : Y \longrightarrow X$ with $\|Q\| \leq \mathcal{C}_2$ for some constant $\mathcal{C}_2 > 0$. Choose a positive constant $\hbar_1 > 0$ such that*

$$\|dF(x) - D\| \leq \frac{1}{2\mathcal{C}_2}, \qquad \forall\, x \in B_{\hbar_1}(x_0), \tag{8}$$

where $B_{\hbar_1}(x_0, X) = \{x \in X |\ \|x - x_0\|_X \leq \hbar_1\}$. Suppose that $x_1 \in X$ satisfies

$$\|F(x_1)\|_Y < \frac{\hbar_1}{4\mathcal{C}_2}, \qquad \|x_1 - x_0\|_X \leq \frac{\hbar_1}{8}. \tag{9}$$

Then there exists a unique $x \in X$ such that

$$F(x) = 0, \quad x - x_1 \in Im\, Q, \quad \|x - x_0\|_X \leq \hbar_1, \quad \|x - x_1\|_X \leq 2\mathcal{C}_2 \|F(x_1)\|_Y. \tag{10}$$

Moreover, write $x := x_0 + \xi + Q \circ f(\xi)$, $\xi \in kerD$. If $F : U \longrightarrow Y$ is of class C^ℓ, where ℓ is a positive integer, then f is of class C^ℓ.

2.2. Weighted sobolev norms.

Let $\Sigma = \bigcup_{\pi_v} (\Sigma_v)$ be a semi-stable curve. Denote by $\mathcal{Q} = \{p_1, ..., p_\nu\}$ the set of nodal points of Σ. Put $\overset{\circ}{\Sigma} = \Sigma - \mathcal{Q}$. Let $u : \overset{\circ}{\Sigma} \to M$ be a J-holomorphic map. We choose cylinder coordinates (s,t) near each nodal point p_i. Over each tube the linearized operator D_u takes the following form

$$D_u = \frac{\partial}{\partial s} + J_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + S. \tag{11}$$

It follows from Theorem 2.1 that $|\nabla u| \to 0$, exponentially and uniformly in t as $s \to \infty$. By the elliptic regularity we have, for any $k > 0$,

$$\sum_{i+j=k} \left| \frac{\partial^k S}{\partial^i s \partial^j t} \right| \leq C_k e^{-\mathfrak{c}s}. \tag{12}$$

for some constants $C_k > 0$. Therefore, the operator $H_s = J_0 \frac{d}{dt} + S$ converges to $H_\infty = J_0 \frac{d}{dt}$. Obviously, the operator D_u is not Fredholm operator because over each nodal end the operator $H_\infty = J_0 \frac{d}{dt}$ has zero eigenvalue. The $\ker H_{i\infty}$ consists of constant vectors in $T_{p_i}M$. To recover a Fredholm theory we use weighted function spaces. We choose a weight α for each end. Fix a positive function W on Σ which has order equal to $e^{\alpha|s|}$ on each end, where α is a small constant such that $0 < \alpha < \mathfrak{c}$

and over each end $H_\infty - \alpha = J_0\frac{d}{dt} - \alpha$ is invertible. We will write the weight function simply as $e^{\alpha|s|}$. For any section $h \in C^\infty(\Sigma; u^*TM)$ and section $\eta \in \Omega^{0,1}(u^*TM)$ we define the norms

$$\|h\|_{1,p,\alpha} = \left(\int_\Sigma (|h|^p + |\nabla h|^p)d\mu\right)^{1/p} + \left(\int_\Sigma e^{2\alpha|s|}(|h|^2 + |\nabla h|^2)d\mu\right)^{1/2} \tag{13}$$

$$\|\eta\|_{p,\alpha} = \left(\int_\Sigma |\eta|^p d\mu\right)^{1/p} + \left(\int_\Sigma e^{2\alpha|s|}|\eta|^2 d\mu\right)^{1/2} \tag{14}$$

for $p > 2$, where all norms and covariant derivatives are taken with respect to the metric $\langle\ \ \rangle$ on u^*TM and the metric on Σ. Set

$$\mathcal{C}(\Sigma; u^*TM) = \{h \in C^\infty(\Sigma; u^*TM); \|h\|_{1,p,\alpha} < \infty\}, \tag{15}$$

$$\mathcal{C}(u^*TM \otimes \wedge^{0,1}) = \{\eta \in \Omega^{0,1}(u^*TM); \|\eta\|_{p,\alpha} < \infty\}. \tag{16}$$

Denote by $W^{1,p,\alpha}(\Sigma; u^*TM)$ and $L^{p,\alpha}(u^*TM\otimes\wedge^{0,1})$ the completions of $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma; u^*TM)$ and $\mathcal{C}(u^*TM\otimes \wedge^{0,1})$ with respect to the norms (13) and (14) respectively.

The operator $D_u : W^{1,p,\alpha} \to L^{p,\alpha}$ is a Fredholm operator so long as α does not lie in the spectrum of the operator $H_{i\infty}$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, \nu$.

Remark 2.3. *The index $ind(D_u, \alpha)$ does not change if α is varied in such a way that α avoids the spectrum of $H_{i\infty}$. Conversely, the index will change if α is moved across an eigenvalue. We will choose α slightly larger than zero such that at each end it does not across the first positive eigenvalue.*

For each nodal point $p_i, i = 1, ..., \nu$, let $h_{i0} \in \ker H_{i\infty}$. Put $H_\infty = (H_{1\infty}, ..., H_{\nu\infty})$, $h_0 = (h_{10}, ..., h_{\nu 0})$. We choose a normal coordinate system near each nodal. h_0 may be considered as a vector field in the coordinate neighborhood. We fix a cutoff function ϱ:

$$\varrho(s) = \begin{cases} 1, & if\ |s| \geq d, \\ 0, & if\ |s| \leq \frac{d}{2} \end{cases}$$

where d is a large positive number. Put

$$\hat{h}_0 = \varrho h_0.$$

Then for d big enough $\hat{h}_0$ is a section in $C^\infty(\Sigma; u^*TM)$ supported in the tube $\{(s,t)||s| \geq \frac{d}{2}, t \in S^1\}$. Denote

$$\mathcal{W}^{1,p,\alpha} = \{h + \hat{h}_0 | h \in W^{1,p,\alpha}, h_0 \in kerH_\infty\}.$$

We define weighted Sobolev norm on $\mathcal{W}^{1,p,\alpha}$ by

$$\|(h, \hat{h}_0)\|_{\Sigma,1,p,\alpha} = \|h\|_{\Sigma,1,p,\alpha} + |h_0|.$$

Let $\Sigma = \mathbb{R} \times S^1$, $E = \Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Let $\pi : E \longrightarrow \Sigma$ be the trivial vector bundle. Consider the Cauchy-Riemannian operator D on E defined by

$$D = \frac{\partial}{\partial s} + J_0\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + S, \tag{17}$$

where $S(s,t) = (S_{ij}(s,t))_{2n\times 2n}$ is a matrix such that (12) hold. Therefore, the operator $H_s = J_0\frac{d}{dt} + S$ converges to $H_\infty = J_0\frac{d}{dt}$ as $s \to \infty$. We choose weight α for each end as above and define the space $W^{1,p,\alpha}(\Sigma; E)$ and $L^{p,\alpha}(E \otimes \wedge^{0,1})$.

By an observation of Donaldson we know that the multiplication by W gives isometries from $W^{1,2,\alpha}$ to $W^{1,2}$ and $L^{2,\alpha}$ to L^2, and

$$\|f\|_{2,\alpha} = \|Wf\|_{L^2}, \quad C^{-1}\|Wf\|_{W^{1,2}} \leq \|f\|_{1,2,\alpha} \leq C\|Wf\|_{W^{1,2}}. \tag{18}$$

Consider the operator

$$D : W^{1,2,\alpha} \to L^{2,\alpha}.$$

It is equivalent to the map (see [5],P59)

$$D_W := D - \frac{\partial}{\partial s}\log W = WDW^{-1} : W^{1,2} \to L^2.$$

Let $h \in W^{1,2,\alpha}$ be the solution of the equation $Dh = \eta$, where $\eta \in L^{2,\alpha}$. Obviously,

$$D_W(Wh) = WD(W^{-1}Wh) = W\eta.$$

Let $\rho = W\eta, \ \ f = Wh$. Then f satisfies the equation $D_W f = \rho$.

We consider the operator $D - \alpha : W^{1,2} \to L^2$. We write $D - \alpha = \frac{\partial}{\partial s} + L + S$, where $L := J_0\frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \alpha$ is a invertible elliptic operator on S^1 when $0 < \alpha < 1$.

The space $L^2(S^1)$ can be decomposed two infinite spaces H^+ and H^- (see P33 in [5]), where

$$H^+ = \left\{\sum a_n e^{\sqrt{-1}nt} | n \geq 0\right\}, \quad H^- = \left\{\sum a_n e^{\sqrt{-1}nt} | n < 0\right\}.$$

Since L is an invertible operator, there exists a complete eigen-function space decomposition such that $L\phi_\lambda = \lambda\phi_\lambda$ where $|\lambda| > \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$. Obviously, $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z} - \alpha$. By choosing $0 < \alpha < 1/2$ we have $\alpha = \min|\lambda|$.

The following lemma can be found in [5]:

Lemma 2.4. *For any* $0 < \alpha < \frac{\mathfrak{c}}{2}$ *there exists a constant* $\mathcal{C}_3 > 0$ *such that for any* h *defined on* $(0, 2lr) \times S^1$ *satisfying* $\frac{\partial h}{\partial s} + J_0\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = 0$, *we have*

$$\|h\,|_{\{(s_o, 2lr - s_o)\times S^1\}}\,\|_{1,p,\alpha} \leq \mathcal{C}_3 e^{-\alpha s_o}\|h\|_{2,\alpha}, \qquad 1 \leq s_o \leq lr. \tag{19}$$

3. GLUING THEORY-PREGLUING

We only consider gluing one nodal case, for general cases the gluing are the same. Let $b = (u_1, u_2; \Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2, j_1, j_2)$, where (Σ_1, j_1) and (Σ_2, j_2) are smooth Riemann surfaces of genus g_1 and g_2 joining at q and $u_i : \Sigma_i \to M$ are J-holomorphic with $u_1(q) = u_2(q)$. Let z_i, $i = 1, 2$, be the local complex coordinates of Σ_i with $z_1(q) = z_2(q) = 0$. Without loss of generality we fix the complex structures j_1, j_2. The neighborhood of $\Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2 \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ is given by

$$z_1 z_2 = w := e^{-R - 2\pi\sqrt{-1}\tau}, \ \ w \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Put $R = 2lr$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We will use (r, τ) as the local coordinates in the neighborhood of $\Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2 \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$. Let

$$z_1 = e^{-s_1 - 2\pi\sqrt{-1}t_1}, \quad z_2 = e^{s_2 + 2\pi\sqrt{-1}t_2}.$$

(s_i, t_i) are called the holomorphic cylindrical coordinates near q. In terms of the holomorphic cylindrical coordinates we write

$$\Sigma_1 - \{q\} = \Sigma_{10}\bigcup\{[0, \infty) \times S^1\},$$

$$\Sigma_2 - \{q\} = \Sigma_{20}\bigcup\{(-\infty, 0] \times S^1\}.$$

For any (r, τ) we construct a surface $\Sigma_{(r)} = \Sigma_1 \#_{(r)} \Sigma_2$ as follows, where and later we use (r) to denote gluing parameters. We cut off the part of Σ_i with cylindrical coordinate $|s_i| > \frac{3lr}{2}$ and glue the remainders along the collars of length lr of the cylinders with the gluing formulas:

$$s_1 = s_2 + 2lr \tag{20}$$

$$t_1 = t_2 + \tau. \tag{21}$$

We glue the map (u_1, u_2) to get a map $u_{(r)}$ from $\Sigma_{(r)}$ to M as follows. Set

$$u_{(r)} = \begin{cases} u_1 \quad on \ \ \Sigma_{10} \bigcup \{(s_1, t_1) | 0 \leq s_1 \leq \frac{lr}{2}, t_1 \in S^1\} \\ \\ u_1(q) = u_2(q) \quad on \ \ \{(s_1, t_1) | \frac{3lr}{4} \leq s_1 \leq \frac{5lr}{4}, t_1 \in S^1\} \\ \\ u_2 \quad on \ \ \Sigma_{20} \bigcup \{(s_2, t_2) | 0 \geq s_2 \geq -\frac{lr}{2}, t_2 \in S^1\} \end{cases}$$

To define the map $u_{(r)}$ in the remaining part we fix a smooth cutoff function $\beta : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ such that

$$\beta(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & if \ \ s \geq 1 \\ 0 & if \ \ s \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

and $\sqrt{1 - \beta^2}$ is a smooth function, $|\beta'(s)| \leq 2$. We assume that r is large enough such that u_i maps the tube $\{(s_i, t_i) | |s_i| \geq \frac{lr}{2}, t_i \in S^1\}$ into a normal coordinate domain of $u_i(q)$. We define

$$u_{(r)} = u_1(q) + \left(\beta \left(3 - \frac{4s_1}{lr} \right) (u_1(s_1, t_1) - u_1(q)) + \beta \left(\frac{4s_1}{lr} - 5 \right) (u_2(s_2, t_2) - u_2(q)) \right).$$

By using the exponential decay of u_i one can easily prove that $u_{(r)}$ are a family of approximate J-holomorphic maps, precisely the following lemma holds.

Lemma 3.1.

$$\|\bar{\partial}_J(u_{(r)})\|_{p,\alpha,r} \leq \mathcal{C}_4 e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{2}}. \tag{22}$$

The constants $\mathcal{C}_4$ *in the above estimates are independent of* r.

For any $\eta \in C^\infty(\Sigma_{(r)}; u^*_{(r)} TM \otimes \wedge^{0,1})$, let η_i be its restriction to the part $\Sigma_{i0} \bigcup \{(s_i, t_i) | \ |s_i| < \frac{3lr}{2}\}$, extended by zero to yield a section over Σ_i. Define

$$\|\eta\|_{p,\alpha,r} = \|\eta_1\|_{\Sigma_1,p,\alpha} + \|\eta_2\|_{\Sigma_2,p,\alpha}. \tag{23}$$

Denote the resulting completed spaces by $L^{p,\alpha}_r$.

We define a norm $\|\cdot\|_{1,p,\alpha,r}$ on $C^\infty(\Sigma_{(r)}; u^*_{(r)} TM)$. For any section $h \in C^\infty(\Sigma_{(r)}; u^*_{(r)} TM)$, denote

$$h_0 = \int_{S^1} h(lr, t) dt, \tag{24}$$

$$h_1 = (h - \hat{h}_0) \beta \left(\tfrac{3}{2} - \tfrac{s_1}{lr} \right) \tag{25}$$

$$h_2 = (h - \hat{h}_0) \left(1 - \beta \left(\tfrac{3}{2} - \tfrac{s_1}{lr} \right) \right). \tag{26}$$

We define

$$\|h\|_{1,p,\alpha,r} = \|h_1\|_{\Sigma_1,1,p,\alpha} + \|h_2\|_{\Sigma_2,1,p,\alpha} + |h_0|. \tag{27}$$

Denote the resulting completed spaces by $\mathcal{W}_r^{1,p,\alpha}$.

We introduce some notations. Choose the cylinder coordinates near nodal points. Denote

$$\mathfrak{D}_i(R_0) = \Sigma_{i0} \cup \{(s_i, t_i) |\ |s_i| \leq R_0\}, \ \ i = 1,\ 2,$$

$$\mathfrak{D}(R_0) = \mathfrak{D}_1(R_0) \bigcup \mathfrak{D}_2(R_0).$$

Choose R_0 such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2} E(u_i; |s_i| \geq \tfrac{R_0}{2}) \leq \tfrac{\hbar_0}{8}, \qquad 4\mathcal{C}_1\mathfrak{c}^{-1}e^{-\frac{\mathfrak{c}R_0}{4}} \leq \tfrac{\hbar_1}{8}, \tag{28}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_1$, $\hbar_0$ and $\hbar_1$ are constants in Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2, respectively. We let $lr >> 4R_0$.

For any $p \in M$ and $\xi \in T_pM$ we denote

$$E_p(\xi) : T_pM \to T_{\exp_p \xi}M,$$

$$E_p(\xi)\xi' := \frac{d}{dt}\exp_p(\xi + t\xi') \mid_{t=0} . \tag{29}$$

Lemma 3.2. *There exists* $\hbar_2 > 0$ *such that for any* J*-holomorphic map* $v : \Sigma_{(r)} \to M$ *with* $v = \exp_{u_{(r)}}(h)$*, if*

$$\left\| h \mid_{\mathfrak{D}(R_0)} \right\|_{C^1} \leq \hbar_2, \tag{30}$$

then for any $0 < \alpha < \mathfrak{c}$

$$\|h\|_{1,p,\alpha,r} \leq \tfrac{\hbar_1}{4},$$

where $\mathfrak{c}$ *is the constant in Theorem 2.1.*

Proof. For $\hbar_2$ small enough, we have $[v(\Sigma_{(r)})] = [u_{(r)}(\Sigma_{(r)})] = \sum [u_i(\Sigma_i)]$. It follows that $\sum E(u_i) = E(v)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum E(v; |s_i| \geq R_0/2) \\ &= \sum E(u_i; |s_i| \geq R_0/2) + \sum \left(E(u_i; |s_i| \leq R_0/2) - E(v; |s_i| \leq R_0/2)\right) \\ &\leq \sum E(u_i; |s_i| \geq R_0/2) + \sum \int_{|s_i| \leq R_0/2} 2|E_{u_i}(h)\nabla h||\nabla u_i| + |E_{u_i}(h)\nabla h|^2 dsdt \\ &\leq \sum E(u_i; |s_i| \geq R_0/2) + C\sum |h \mid_{\mathfrak{D}_i(R_0)} |_{C^1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\nabla v = P_{u_i,v}\nabla u_i + E_{u_i}(h)\nabla h$, when $|s_i| \leq R_0/2$. It follows that

$$E(v; \Sigma_{(r)} - \mathfrak{D}(R_0/2)) \leq \frac{\hbar_0}{4},$$

when $0 < \hbar_2 < \frac{\hbar_0}{8C}$. Then by Theorem 2.1 we have

$$|\nabla v \mid_{\Sigma_{(r)} - \mathfrak{D}(R_0)} | \leq \mathcal{C}_1 e^{-\mathfrak{c}R_0/2}, \qquad |\nabla u_i \mid_{\Sigma_{(r)} - \mathfrak{D}(R_0)} | \leq \mathcal{C}_1 e^{-\mathfrak{c}R_0/2} \tag{31}$$

for all $R_0 \leq |s_i| \leq lr - R_0$. Together with (30) we have

$$\|h\|_{1,p,\alpha} \leq \frac{\hbar_1}{8}$$

when $\hbar_2$ small enough. Then lemma follows. $\square$

The lemma can be generalized to the case of gluing several Riemann surfaces and several nodal points.

4. **Gluing theory–Regularization**

It is well-known that if D_u is surjective for any $b = (u, (\Sigma, j); \mathbf{y}) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(M, g, m)$, then $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(M, g, m)$ is stratified by smooth orbifolds. When the transversality fails we need to take the stabilization (we use the terminology ”regularization” in this paper). In [16] and [10] the authors outlined a regularization procedure. In [4] Chen and Tian introduced a class of new objects ”virtual manifolds/orbifolds”, developed the integration theory and discussed systematically and more clearly the regularization procedure for both Fredholm system and orbifold Fredholm system. This is a very useful tool to study moduli problem. In this section we explain simply the method in [4, 3] and suggest the readers to see [4, 3] for details.

4.1. **Local regularization.**

We first discuss the top strata, then consider lower stratas.

(1) Top strata.

Let $b = (u, (\Sigma, j); \mathbf{y}) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(M, g, m)$. Here (Σ, j) is a smooth Riemann surface of genus g with complex structure j.

We discuss two different cases:

(1.1) Σ is stable.

Denote by O_j a neighborhood of complex structure j on Σ. Note that we change the complex structure in the compact set $\mathfrak{D}(R_0)$ of Σ away from the nodal points. A neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_b$ of b can be described as

$$O_j \times \{\exp_u(h); h \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma; u^*TM), \|h\|_{1,p} < \epsilon\}/stab_b.$$

(1.2) Σ is unstable.

In this case the automorphism group Aut_Σ is infinite. One must construct a slice of the action Aut_Σ and construct a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_b$ of b. This is done in [3]. We omit it here.

We construct local regularization. For simplicity we assume that $stab_b$ is trivial. There is a neighborhood V of b such that $\mathcal{E}$ is trivialized over V, more precisely, the parallel transportation $P_{u,v}$ gives a isomorphism $\mathcal{E}|_u \to \mathcal{E}|_v$ for any $v \in V$. Choose $K_b \subset \mathcal{E}|_u$ to be a finite dimensional subspace such that

$$K_b + image D_u = \mathcal{E}|_u, \tag{32}$$

where $D_u : W^{1,p}(u^*TM) \to \mathcal{E}|_u$. Without loss of generality we may assume that every element of K_b is smooth along u and supports in the common compact subset $\mathfrak{D}(R_0)$. Define a thickned Fredholm system $(K_b \times V, K_b \times \mathcal{E}|_V, S)$, where

$$S(\kappa, v) = \bar{\partial}_J v + P_{u;v}\kappa \in \mathcal{E}_v, \quad \forall\ (\kappa, v) \in K_b \times V.$$

By (32), there exists a smaller neighborhood of b, still denoted by V, such that $DS_{(\kappa,v)} : K_b \times W^{1,p} \to L^p$ is surjective for any $(\kappa, v) \in K_b \times V$.

There are open neighborhoods $V_b^{(i)}$ of b for $i = 1, 2, 3$ such that

$$V_b^{(1)} \subset \overline{V_b^{(1)}} \subset V_b^{(2)} \subset \overline{V_b^{(2)}} \subset V_b^{(3)} \subset \overline{V_b^{(3)}} \subset V$$

and there is a smooth cut-off function $\beta_b : V_b^{(3)} \to [0, 1]$ such that $\beta_b \equiv 1$ on $V_b^{(1)}$ and is supported in $V_b^{(2)}$. Here $\overline{V_b^{(i)}}$ is the closure of $V_b^{(i)}$. In fact, using the Riemann metric (4) on M we can define a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on $\mathcal{B}$. We can choose $V_b^{(i)}$ as a ball of radius $i\rho$ centered at b with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|$, where ρ is a small constant. It is well-known that $\|\cdot\|$ is a smooth function on $\mathcal{B}$ (see [3]). Then it is easy to construct the smooth cut-off function β_b.

Definition 4.1. *A* local regularization *at b is defined to be the thickened Fredholm system*

$$(K_b \times V_b^{(3)}, K_b \times \mathcal{E}|_{V_b^{(3)}}, \mathcal{S})$$

with $\mathcal{S}(\kappa, v) = \bar{\partial}_J v + \beta_b P_{u;v}\kappa$.

Then for each $b' = (\kappa, v) \in K_b \times V_b^{(1)}$ there exists a right inverse

$$Q_{b'} : L^p \to K_b \times W^{1,p}$$

such that $\|Q_{b'}\| \leq C_1$. Obviously, $D\mathcal{S}_{b'} : K_b \times \mathcal{W}^{1,p} \to L^p$ is also surjective, $Q_{b'} : L^p \to K_b \times \mathcal{W}^{1,p}$ is also a right inverse of $D\mathcal{S}_{b'}$.

Remark 4.2. *In case that $stab_b$ is non-trivial, we should consider the orbifold chart $\pi : V_{\tilde{b}} \to V_b$. We need choose a $stab_b$-equivariant trivialization $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}|_{\tilde{V}}$, a $stab_b$-equivariant $\tilde{K}_b$ and a smooth $stab_b$-equivariant cut-off function $\tilde{\beta}_b$. Then we can construct a $stab_b$-equivariant local regularization. It is more convenient to use groupoid language.*

(2) Lower strata.

We shall consider a simple case, the discussion for general cases are the same. Let D be a strata whose domain has two components (Σ_1, j_1) and (Σ_2, j_2) joining at q. We introduce the holomorphic cylindrical coordinates on Σ_i near q.

Let $b = (u_1, u_2; \Sigma_1 \wedge \Sigma_2, j_1, j_2)$, where (Σ_1, j_1) and (Σ_2, j_2) are smooth Riemann surfaces of genus g_1 and g_2 joining at q and $u_i : \Sigma_i \to M$ are J-holomorphic maps with $u_1(q) = u_2(q)$. Suppose that both (u_i, Σ_i, j_i) are stable. A neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_b^D$ of b in the strata D can be described as

$$O_{j_1} \times O_{j_2} \times \left\{ \left(\exp_{u_1}(h_1 + \hat{h}_{10}), \exp_{u_2}(h_2 + \hat{h}_{20}) \right) | h_i \in W^{1,p,\alpha}(\Sigma; u_i{}^* TM) \right.,$$

$$\left. h_{10} = h_{20} \in T_{u_1(q)}M, \|h_i\|_{1,p,\alpha} + |h_0| < \epsilon \right\} / stab_u.$$

The fiber of $\mathcal{E}_D(M, g, m) \to \mathcal{B}_D(M, g, m)$ at b is $L^{p,\alpha}(u_1^* TM \otimes \wedge^{0,1}) \times L^{p,\alpha}(u_2^* TM \otimes \wedge^{0,1})$.

We use the gluing argument to describe the neighborhoods $\mathcal{U}_b$ of b in the top strata. Denote $Glu_{T_0} = \{(r, \tau) | 0 \leq \tau < 1, T_0 \leq r \leq \infty\}$. Then

$$\mathcal{U}_b = O_{j_1} \times O_{j_2} \times Glu_{T_0} \times \bigcup_{T_0 \leq r < \infty} B(u_{(r)}, \epsilon)$$

where $B(u_{(r)}, \epsilon) = \{u \in \mathcal{B} | \; u = \exp_{u_{(r)}}(h), \quad \|h\|_{1,p} < \epsilon\}$.

Again we assume that $stab_b$ is trivial. Choose $K_b = (K_1, K_2) \subset \mathcal{E}|_b = (\mathcal{E}_{u_1}, \mathcal{E}_{u_2})$ to be a finite dimensional subspace such that

$$K_1 + imageD_{u_1} = \mathcal{E}_{u_1}, \quad K_2 + imageD_{u_2} = \mathcal{E}_{u_2}.$$

where $D_{u_i} : W^{1,p,\alpha} \to \mathcal{E}_{u_i}$. We may assume that every element of K_i is smooth along u_i and supports in the compact subset $\mathfrak{D}(R_0)$ of Σ_i. We choose $T_0 > R_0$ so large that for $r > T_0$

$$K_b \subset \mathcal{E}|_V \quad for \ a \ neighbourhood \ V \ of \ b.$$

Note that $u_{(r)}|_{|s_i| \leq R_0} = u_i|_{|s_i| \leq R_0}$ and $supp \ (K_b) \subset \{|s_i| \leq R_0\}$, we can naturally identify K_b and $K_{b_{(r)}}$. Then $P(u_{(r)}, \cdot)|_{|s_i| \leq R_0} \kappa$ is independent of r for any $\kappa \in K_b$. We define a thickned Fredholm system and regularization equation as in **(1)**. Then there exists a neighborhood V of b, such that $D\mathcal{S}_{b'} : K_b \times W^{1,p,\alpha} \to L^{p,\alpha}$ is surjective for any $b' = (\kappa, v) \in K_b \times V$. Then $D\mathcal{S}_{b'} : K_b \times \mathcal{W}^{1,p,\alpha} \to L^{p,\alpha}$ is also surjective.

4.2. **Global regularization and virtual neighborhoods.** As $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(M, g, m)$ is compact, there exist finite points b_i, $1 \leq i \leq n$, such that the collection $\{U^{(1)}_{b_i}\}$ is an open cover of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(M, g, m)$. Set

$$X^{(1)} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} U^{(1)}_{b_i}, \quad X^{(3)} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} U^{(3)}_{b_i}.$$

For any $I \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, define

$$X'_I = \left(X^{(3)} \cap \bigcap_{i \in I} U^{(3)}_{b_i} \right) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j \notin I} \overline{U^{(2)}_{b_i}} \right),$$

$$K_I = \prod_{i \in I} K_{b_i}, \quad X_I = X'_I \cap X^{(1)}.$$

Then $\{X'_I\}_{I \subset \{1,2,\ldots,n\}}$ is an open covering of $X^{(3)}$ and

$$X^{(1)} = \bigcup_{I \subset \{1,2,\ldots,n\}} X_I.$$

Let

$$(C_I, F_I, \mathcal{S}_I)$$

be a Fredholm system where $C_I = K_I \times X_I$ and $F_I = K_I \times E|_{X_I} \to C_I$ is a Banach bundle, and the section $\mathcal{S}_I : C_I \to F_I$ is given by

$$\mathcal{S}_I((\kappa_i)_{i \in I}, v) = \bar{\partial}_J v + \sum_{i \in I} \beta_{b_i}(v) P_{b_i; v}(\kappa_i).$$

Then $(C_I, F_I, \mathcal{S}_I)$ is a *regular* Fredholm system. The collection $\mathbf{C} = \{C_I\}$ forms an infinite dimensional virtual Banach orbifold, $\mathbf{F} = \{F_I\}$ is a Banach bundle over $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{S} = \{\mathcal{S}_I\}$ is a *transversal Fredholm* section of $\mathbf{F}$.

This collection $\{(\mathbf{C},\mathbf{F},\mathbf{S})\}$ is called a global regularization of the original Fredholm system $(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{E},\overline{\partial}_J)$. The $\mathcal{S}_I^{-1}(0)$ is a topological orbifold stratified space. By implicity function theorem every strata is smooth.

The following lemma is proved in [4, 3].

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a finite dimensional virtual orbifold system for* $(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{E},\overline{\partial}_J)$ *which is a collection of triples*

$$\{(U_I,E_I,\sigma_I)|I\subset\{1,2,\cdots,n\}\}$$

indexed by a partially ordered set $(I=2^{\{1,2,\cdots,n\}},\subset)$, *where*

1. $\{U_I|I\subset\{1,2,\cdots,n\}\}$ *is a finite dimensional proper étale virtual groupoid, where* $U_I=\mathcal{S}_I^{-1}(0)$,
2. $\{E_I\}$ *is a finite rank virtual vector bundle over* $\{U_I\}$,
3. $\{\sigma_I\}$ *is a section of the virtual vector bundle* $\{E_I\}$ *whose zeros* $\{\sigma_I^{-1}(0)\}$ *form a cover of* $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(M,g,m)$.

Let $U_{I,\epsilon}$ be the set of points $((\kappa_i)_{i\in I},v)\in U_I$ such that $\sum_{i\in I}\|\kappa_i\|_{p,\alpha}\leq\epsilon,$ where $I\subset\{1,2,...,n\}$.

By the standard argument (see [13]) we conclude that:

Theorem 4.4. $\{U_{I,\epsilon}(M)\}$ *is a compact virtual orbifold.*

5. Gluing theory– analysis estimates

We consider the case of gluing one node, the general cases are similar. Let $b=((u_1,u_2),\Sigma_1\wedge\Sigma_2;j_1,j_2)\in\overline{\mathcal{M}}_A(M,g,m)$, where (Σ_1,j_1) and (Σ_2,j_2) are smooth Riemann surfaces of genus g_1 and g_2 joining at q and $u_i:\Sigma_1\to M$, $i=1,2$ are J-holomorphic maps such that $u_1(q)=u_2(q)$. Denote $u=(u_1,u_2)$.

For any $(\kappa,h,h_0)\in K_b\times\mathcal{W}^{1,p,\alpha}(u^*TM)$, where $h=(h_1,h_2)\in W^{1,p,\alpha}(\Sigma;u^*TM)$, we define

$$\|(\kappa,h)\|_{1,p,\alpha}=\|\kappa\|_{p,\alpha}+\|h_1\|_{1,p,\alpha}+\|h_2\|_{1,p,\alpha},\quad \|(\kappa,h,h_0)\|=\|(\kappa,h)\|_{1,p,\alpha}+|h_0|. \tag{33}$$

For any $(\kappa,h_{(r)})\in K_b\times W^{1,p,\alpha}(u_{(r)}^*TM)$ we define

$$\|(\kappa,h_{(r)})\|=\|\kappa\|_{p,\alpha}+\|h_{(r)}\|_{1,p,\alpha,r}. \tag{34}$$

5.1. Estimates of right inverse.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that* $D\mathcal{S}_b|_{K_b\times W^{1,p,\alpha}}:K_b\times W^{1,p,\alpha}\to L^{p,\alpha}$ *is surjective. Denote by* $Q_b:L^{p,\alpha}\to K_b\times W^{1,p,\alpha}$ *a right inverse of* $D\mathcal{S}_b$. *Then* $D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$ *is surjective for* r *large enough. Moreover, there are a right inverses* $Q_{b_{(r)}}$ *such that*

$$D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\circ Q_{b_{(r)}}=Id \tag{35}$$

$$\|Q_{b_{(r)}}\|\leq\mathcal{C}_2 \tag{36}$$

for some constant $\mathcal{C}_2>0$ *independent of* r.

Proof. We first construct an approximate right inverse $Q'_{b_{(r)}}$ such that the following estimates holds

$$\|Q'_{b_{(r)}}\| \leq C_1 \tag{37}$$

$$\|D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \circ Q'_{b_{(r)}} - Id\| \leq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{38}$$

Then the operator $D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \circ Q'_{b_{(r)}}$ is invertible and a right inverse $Q_{b_{(r)}}$ of $D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$ is given by

$$Q_{b_{(r)}} = Q'_{b_{(r)}}(D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \circ Q'_{b_{(r)}})^{-1}. \tag{39}$$

Denote $\beta_1 = \beta(3/2 - \frac{s_1}{lr})$. Let $\beta_2 \geq 0$ be a smooth function such that $\beta_2^2 = 1 - \beta_1^2$. Given $\eta \in L_r^{2,\alpha}$, we have a pair (η_1, η_2), where

$$\eta_1 = \beta_1\eta, \quad \eta_2 = \beta_2\eta.$$

Let $Q_b(\eta_1, \eta_2) = (\kappa_b, h)$. We may write h as (h_1, h_2), and define

$$h_{(r)} = h_1\beta_1 + h_2\beta_2. \tag{40}$$

Note that on $\{\frac{lr}{2} \leq s_1 \leq \frac{3lr}{2}\}$, $\kappa = 0$ and on $\{|s_i| \leq \frac{lr}{2}\}$ we have $u_{(r)} = u_i$, $\kappa_{(r)} = \kappa_b$, so along $u_{(r)}$ we have $\kappa_{(r)} = \kappa_b$. Then we define

$$Q'_{b_{(r)}}\eta = (\kappa_{(r)}, h_{(r)}) = (\kappa_b, h_{(r)}). \tag{41}$$

Since $|\beta_1| \leq 1$ and $|\frac{\partial\beta_1}{\partial s_1}| \leq \frac{4}{lr}$, (37) follows from $\|Q_b\| \leq C_2$ for some constant $C_2 > 0$. We prove (38). Since $\kappa_b + D_u h = \eta$ we have

$$D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \circ Q'_{b_{(r)}}\eta = \eta, \qquad |s_i| \leq \tfrac{lr}{2}. \tag{42}$$

It suffices to estimate the left hand side of (38) in the annulus $\frac{lr}{2} \leq |s_i| \leq \frac{3lr}{2}$. Note that in this annulus

$$\beta_1^2 + \beta_2^2 = 1, \ \ \kappa_b = 0, \quad D_{u_i}h_i = \eta_i,$$

$$\beta_1 D_{u_1}h_1 + \beta_2 D_{u_2}h_2 = (\beta_1^2 + \beta_2^2)\eta.$$

Since near $u_1(q) = u_2(q)$, $D_{u_i} = \partial_s + J_0\partial_t + S_{u_i}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \circ Q'_{b_{(r)}}\eta - (\beta_1^2 + \beta_2^2)\eta = \kappa_{b_{(r)}} + D_{u_{(r)}}h_{(r)} - (\beta_1^2 + \beta_2^2)\eta \\ = \ &(\bar\partial\beta_1)h_1 + \beta_1(S_{u_{(r)}} - S_{u_1})h_1 + (\bar\partial\beta_2)h_2 + \beta_2(S_{u_{(r)}} - S_{u_2})h_2. \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

By the exponential decay of S and $\beta_1^2 + \beta_2^2 = 1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\|D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \circ Q'_{b_{(r)}}\eta - \eta\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} = \left\|D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \circ Q'_{b_{(r)}}\eta - (\beta_1^2 + \beta_2^2)\eta\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} \\ \leq \ &\frac{C_3}{r}\left(\|h_1\|_{p,\alpha} + \|h_2\|_{p,\alpha}\right) \leq \frac{C_4}{r}\|\eta\|_{p,\alpha,r} \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

for some constant $C_4 > 0$. In the last inequality we used that $\|Q_b\| \leq C_2$ and $(h_1, h_2) = \pi_2 \circ Q_b(\eta_1, \eta_2)$, where π_2 denotes the projection into the second component. Then (38) follows by choosing r big enough. The estimate (38) implies that

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \|D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \circ Q'_{b_{(r)}}\| \leq \frac{3}{2}. \tag{45}$$

Then (36) follows. □

5.2. **Isomorphism between $KerD\mathcal{S}_b$ and $KerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$.** Put

$$E_1 := KerD\mathcal{S}_{u_1},\ \ E_2 := KerD\mathcal{S}_{u_2},\quad \mathbb{H} = T_qM,$$

Denote

$$KerD\mathcal{S}_b := E_1 \bigoplus_{\mathbb{H}} E_2.$$

For a fixed gluing parameter $(r) = (r,\tau)$ we define a map $I_r : KerD\mathcal{S}_b \longrightarrow KerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$ as follows. For any $(\kappa, h, h_0) \in KerD\mathcal{S}_b$, where $h \in W^{1,p,\alpha}(\Sigma; u^*TM)$, we write $h = (h_1, h_2)$, and define

$$h_{(r)} = \hat{h}_0 + h_1\beta_1 + h_2\beta_2, \tag{46}$$

$$I_r(\kappa, h, h_0) = (\kappa, h_{(r)}) - Q_{b_{(r)}} \circ D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}(\kappa, h_{(r)}). \tag{47}$$

Lemma 5.2. *I_r is an isomorphisms for r big enough, and*

$$\|I_r\| \leq \mathcal{C}_5,$$

for some constant $\mathcal{C}_5 > 0$ independent of r.

Proof. The proof is basically a similar gluing argument as in [5]. The proof is devides into 2 steps.

Step 1. We define a map $I'_r : KerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \longrightarrow KerD\mathcal{S}_b$ and show that I'_r is injective for r big enough. For any $(\kappa, h) \in KerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$ we denote by h_i the restriction of h to the part $|s_i| \leq lr + \frac{1}{\alpha}$, we get a pair (h_1, h_2). Let

$$h_0 = \int_{S^1} h\,(lr, t)\, dt. \tag{48}$$

We denote

$$\beta[h] = \Big((h_1 - \hat{h}_0)\beta\,(\alpha lr + 1 - \alpha s_1) + \hat{h}_0,\ \ (h_2 - \hat{h}_0)\beta\,(\alpha lr + 1 + \alpha s_2) + \hat{h}_0\Big)$$

and define $I'_r : KerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \longrightarrow KerD\mathcal{S}_b$ by

$$I'_r(\kappa, h) = (\kappa, \beta[h]) - Q_b \circ D\mathcal{S}_b(\kappa, \beta[h]), \tag{49}$$

where Q_b denotes the right inverse of $D\mathcal{S}_b|_{K_b\times W^{1,p,\alpha}} : K_b \times W^{1,p,\alpha} \to L^{p,\alpha}$. Since $D\mathcal{S}_b \circ Q_b = D\mathcal{S}_b|_{K_b\times W^{1,p,\alpha}} \circ Q_b = I$, we have $I'_r(KerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}) \subset KerD\mathcal{S}_b$.

Since κ and $D_u(\beta(h - \hat{h}_0))$ have compact support and $S_u \in L^{p,\alpha}$, we have $D\mathcal{S}_b(\kappa, \beta[h]) \in L^{p,\alpha}$. Then $Q_b \circ D\mathcal{S}_b(\kappa, \beta[h]) \in K_b \times W^{1,p,\alpha}$.

Let $(\kappa, h) \in KerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$ such that $I'_r(\kappa, h) = 0$. Since $\beta(h - \hat{h}_0) \in W^{1,p,\alpha}$ and $Q_b \circ D\mathcal{S}_b(\kappa, \beta[h]) \in K_b \times W^{1,p,\alpha}$, then $I'_r(\kappa, h) = 0$ implies that $h_0 = 0$. From (49) we have

$$\|I'_r(\kappa, h) - (\kappa, \beta h)\|_{1,p,\alpha} \leq C_1\|\kappa + D_u(\beta h)\|_{p,\alpha}$$

$$= C_1\left\|\kappa + \beta\left(D_u h + D_{u_{(r)}}h + \kappa - D_{u_{(r)}}h - \kappa\right) + (\bar{\partial}\beta)h\right\|_{p,\alpha},$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$. Since $(\kappa, h) \in KerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$, we have $\kappa + D_{u_{(r)}}h = 0$. We choose $lr > 4R_0$. As $\kappa|_{|s_i|\geq R_0} = 0$ and $\beta|_{|s_i|\leq lr} = 1$ we have $\kappa = \beta\kappa$. Therefore

$$\|I'_r(\kappa, h) - (\kappa, \beta h)\|_{1,p,\alpha} \leq C_1\|(\bar{\partial}\beta)h + \beta(S_u - S_{u(r)})h\|_{p,\alpha}.$$

Note that

$$S_u = S_{u(r)} \quad if \ \ |s_i| \le \tfrac{lr}{2}.$$

By exponential decay of S we have

$$\|(S_u - S_{u(r)})\beta h\|_{p,\alpha} \le C_2 e^{-\mathfrak{c}\frac{lr}{2}} \|\beta h\|_{1,p,\alpha}$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$. Since $(\bar\partial\beta(\alpha lr + 1 - \alpha s_1))h_1$ supports in $lr \le s_1 \le lr + \frac{1}{\alpha}$, and over this part

$$|\bar\partial\beta(\alpha lr + 1 - \alpha s_1)| \le 2|\alpha|, \quad lr - \frac{1}{\alpha} \le |s_2| \le lr,$$
$$\beta(\alpha lr + 1 + \alpha s_2) = 1, \quad e^{2\alpha|s_1|} \le e^4 e^{2\alpha|s_2|},$$

we obtain

$$\|(\bar\partial\beta(\alpha lr + 1 - \alpha s_1))h_1\|_{p,\alpha} \le 2|\alpha|e^4\|h_2\|_{p,\alpha} \le 2|\alpha|e^4\|\beta h\|_{p,\alpha}.$$

Similar inequality for $(\bar\partial\beta(\alpha lr + 1 + \alpha s_2))h_2$ also holds. So we have

$$\|(\bar\partial\beta)h\|_{p,\alpha} \le 4|\alpha|e^4\|\beta h\|_{1,p,\alpha}.$$

Hence

$$\|I'_r(\kappa, h) - (\kappa, \beta h)\|_{1,p,\alpha} \le (4e^4|\alpha| + C_3 e^{-\frac{\mathfrak{c}lr}{2}})\|\beta h\|_{1,p,\alpha} \le 1/2\|\beta h\|_{1,p,\alpha} \tag{50}$$

for some constant $C_3 > 0$, here we choosed $0 < \alpha \le \frac{1}{16e^4}$ and r big enough such that $lr > \frac{4}{\alpha}$ and $C_3 e^{-\frac{\mathfrak{c}lr}{2}} < 1/4$. Then $I'_r(\kappa, h) = 0$ and (50) gives us

$$\|\kappa\|_{p,\alpha} = 0, \ \ \|\beta h\|_{1,p,\alpha} = 0.$$

It follows that $\kappa = 0, \ \ h = 0$. So I'_r is injective.

Step 2. Since $\|Q_{b_{(r)}}\|$ is uniformly bounded, from (47) and (36), we have

$$\|I_r(\kappa, h, h_0) - (\kappa, h_{(r)})\|_{1,p,\alpha,r} \le C_4\|D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}(\kappa, h_{(r)})\|,$$

for some constant $C_4 > 0$. By a similar culculation as in the proof of Lemma 5.1 we obtain

$$\|I_r(\kappa, h, h_0) - (\kappa, h_{(r)})\|_{1,p,\alpha,r} \le \frac{C_5}{r}(\|h\|_{p,\alpha} + |h_0|), \tag{51}$$

for some constant $C_5 > 0$. In particular, it holds for $p = 2$. It remains to show that $\|h_{(r)}\|_{2,\alpha,r}$ is close to $\|h\|_{2,\alpha}$. Denote π_2 the projection into the second component, that is, $\pi_2(\kappa, h, h_0) = h$. Then $\pi_2(kerD\mathcal{S}_b)$ is a finite dimentional space. Let $f_i, \ i = 1, .., d$ be an orthonormal basis. Then $F = \sum f_i^2 e^{2\alpha|s|}$ is an integrable function on Σ. For any $0 < \epsilon' < 1$, we may choose R_0 so big that

$$\int_{|s_i| \ge R_0} F \le \epsilon'.$$

Then the restriction of h to $|s_i| \ge R_0$ satisfies

$$\|h|_{|s_i| \ge R_0}\|_{2,\alpha} \le \epsilon'\|h\|_{2,\alpha},$$

therefore

$$\|h_{(r)}\|_{2,\alpha,r} \ge \|h|_{|s_i| \le R_0}\|_{2,\alpha} + |h_0| \ge (1 - \epsilon')\|h\|_{2,\alpha} + |h_0|, \tag{52}$$

for $lr > 4R_0$. Suppose that $I_r(\kappa, h, h_0) = 0$. Then (51) and (52) give us $h = 0$ and $h_0 = 0$, and so $\kappa = 0$. Hence I_r is injective.

The **step 1** and **step 2** together show that both I_r and I'_r are isomorphisms for r big enough. □

5.3. **Gluing maps.** Following [13] we choose the complex linear connection

$$\widetilde{\nabla}_X Y = \nabla_X Y - \tfrac{1}{2} J \left(\nabla_X J\right) Y$$

induced by the Levi-Civita connection ∇ of the metric g_J. There is a neighborhood V of $b_{(r)}$ in $\mathcal{B}_A(M, g, m)$ such that $\mathcal{E}$ is trivialized over V, more precisely, $P_{u_{(r)},v}$ gives a isomorphism $\mathcal{E}|_{u_{(r)}} \to \mathcal{E}|_v$ for any $v \in V$. Consider a map

$$F_{(r)} : K_{b_{(r)}} \times \mathcal{W}^{1,p,\alpha}_r(\Sigma_{(r)}; u^*_{(r)}TM) \to L^{p,\alpha}_r(u^*_{(r)}TM \otimes \wedge^{0,1})$$
$$F_{(r)}(\kappa, h) = P_{\exp_{u_{(r)}} h, u_{(r)}} \left(\bar{\partial}_J \exp_{u_{(r)}} h + P_{u_{(r)}, \exp_{u_{(r)}} h}(\kappa) \right).$$

Let $(\kappa_\tau, h_\tau) : [0, \delta) \longrightarrow K_{b_{(r)}} \times \mathcal{W}^{1,p,\alpha}_r(\Sigma_{(r)}; u^*_{(r)}TM)$ be a curve satisfying

$$\kappa_0 = \kappa, \quad h_0 = h, \quad \frac{d}{d\tau}\kappa_\tau \mid_{\tau=0} = \eta, \quad \frac{d}{d\tau} h_\tau \mid_{\tau=0} = g$$

By the same method of [13] we can prove

Lemma 5.3. **1.:** $dF_{(r)}(0) = D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$.

2.: *There is a constant* $0 < \hbar_3 < \hbar_1$ *such that for any* $(\kappa, h) \in K_{b_{(r)}} \times \mathcal{W}^{1,p,\alpha}_r(\Sigma_{(r)}; u^*_{(r)}TM)$ *with* $\|(\kappa, h)\| < \hbar_3$ *and* $\|F_{u_{(r)}}(\kappa, h)\|_{p,\alpha,r} \leq 2\hbar_3$, *the following inequality holds*

$$\|dF_{(r)}(\kappa, h) - dF_{(r)}(0)\| \leq \tfrac{1}{4\mathcal{C}_2}, \tag{53}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_2$ *and* $\hbar_1$ *are constants in Lemma 5.1 and Theorem 2.2.*

Since the curvature $|Rm|$ is uniform bounded above, there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that $|E_p(\xi)| \leq C_1$ for any $p \in M$ and $\xi \in T_pM$ with $|\xi| = 1$. For any $\|(\kappa, h)\| \leq \frac{\hbar_3}{8C_1\mathcal{C}_2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_{(r)}(\kappa, h)\|_{p,\alpha,r} &= \|\bar{\partial}_J \exp_{u_{(r)}} h + \kappa\|_{p,\alpha,r} \\ &\leq \|\overline{\partial}_J u_{(r)}\|_{p,\alpha,r} + \|E_{u_{(r)}}(h)\partial_s h\|_{p,\alpha,r} + \|E_{u_{(r)}}(h)\partial_t h\|_{p,\alpha,r} + \|\kappa\|_{p,\alpha} \\ &\leq \|\overline{\partial}_J u_{(r)}\|_{p,\alpha,r} + C_1\|(\kappa, h)\| \leq \mathcal{C}_4 e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{2}} + \tfrac{\hbar_3}{8\mathcal{C}_2} \leq \tfrac{\hbar_3}{4\mathcal{C}_2}, \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

when r big enough. Here $E_{u_{(r)}}(h)$ defined in (29). It follows from (2) of Lemma 5.3 and (54) that

$$\|dF_{(r)}(\kappa, h) - D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\| \leq \tfrac{1}{4\mathcal{C}_2}. \tag{55}$$

Then $F_{(r)}$ satisfies the conditions in Theorem 2.2. It follows that for any $(\kappa, \zeta) \in kerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$ with $\|(\kappa, \zeta)\| \leq \frac{\hbar_3}{8C_1\mathcal{C}_2}$ there exists a unique (κ_v, ξ) such that $F_{(r)}(\kappa_v, \xi) = 0$. Since $Q_{b_{(r)}}$ is injective and $K_{b_{(r)}} \times \mathcal{W}^{1,p,\alpha}_r(\Sigma_{(r)}; u^*_{(r)}TM) = imQ_{b_{(r)}} + kerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$, then there exists a unique smooth map

$$f_{(r)} : Ker\ D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \to L^{p,\alpha}_r(u^*_{(r)}TM \otimes \wedge^{0,1})$$

such that $(\kappa_v, \xi) = (\kappa, \zeta) + Q_{b_{(r)}} \circ f_{(r)}(\kappa, \zeta)$.

It is easy to check that there exists a constant $\mathcal{C}_6 > 0$ independent of r such that

$$\|D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\| \leq \mathcal{C}_6. \tag{56}$$

On the other hand, suppose that (κ_v, ξ) satisfies

$$F_{(r)}(\kappa_v, \xi) = 0, \qquad \|(\kappa_v, \xi)\| \leq \frac{\hbar_3}{8(1 + \mathcal{C}_2\mathcal{C}_6)C_1\mathcal{C}_2}. \tag{57}$$

We write $(\kappa_v, \xi) = (\kappa, \zeta) + Q_{b_{(r)}} \circ \eta$, where $(\kappa, \zeta) \in kerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$ and $\eta \in L^{p,\alpha}_r(u^*_{(r)}TM \otimes \wedge^{0,1})$. Since $(\kappa, \zeta) = (I - Q_{b_{(r)}} \circ D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}})(\kappa_v, \xi)$, we have $\|(\kappa, \zeta)\| \leq \frac{\hbar_3}{8C_1\mathcal{C}_2}$, then $\eta = f_{(r)}(\kappa, \zeta)$, i.e.,

$$(\kappa_v, \xi) = (\kappa, \zeta) + Q_{b_{(r)}} \circ f_{(r)}(\kappa, \zeta). \tag{58}$$

Hence the zero set of $F_{(r)}$ is locally the form $(\kappa, \zeta) + Q_{b_{(r)}} \circ f_{(r)}(\kappa, \zeta)$, i.e

$$F_{(r)}\left((\kappa, \zeta) + Q_{b_{(r)}} \circ f_{(r)}(\kappa, \zeta)\right) = 0 \tag{59}$$

where $(\kappa, \zeta) \in Ker\ D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$.

For fixed (r) denote

$$U_{b_{(r)}} = \left\{(\kappa, h) \in K_{b_{(r)}} \times \mathcal{W}^{1,p,\alpha}_r(\Sigma_{(r)}; u^*_{(r)}TM) \mid \bar{\partial}_J \exp_{u_{(r)}} h + P_{u_{(r)}, \exp_{u_{(r)}} h}(\kappa) = 0\right\},$$

$$(\kappa_{(r)}, h_{(r)}) := I_r(\kappa, \zeta) + Q_{b_{(r)}} \circ f_{(r)} \circ I_r(\kappa, \zeta)), \quad \hbar_4 = \frac{\hbar_3}{8C_1\mathcal{C}_2\mathcal{C}_5}. \tag{60}$$

Since $I_r : kerD\mathcal{S}_b \to KerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$ is a isomorphism, we have proved the following

Lemma 5.4. *There is a neighborhood O of 0 in $kerD\mathcal{S}_b$, defined by*

$$O = \{(\kappa, \zeta) \in kerD\mathcal{S}_b \mid \|(\kappa, \zeta)\| \leq \hbar_4\},$$

and neighborhoods O_{j_k} of j_k, $k = 1, 2$ and $R_0 > 0$ such that

$$glu_{(r)} : O_{j_1} \times O_{j_2} \times O \to U_{b_{(r)}}$$

defined by

$$glu_{(r)}(j_1, j_2, \kappa, \zeta) = (\kappa_{(r)}, h_{(r)})$$

is a family of orientation preserving local diffeomorphisms, where $lr > 4R_0$.

We may choose $((j_1, j_2), r, \tau, \kappa, \zeta)$ as a local coordinate system around b in $U_{I,\epsilon}$. We write $f_{(r)} \circ I_r$ as a function $f(j_1, j_2, r, \tau, \kappa, \zeta)$. As I_r is a smooth map we can see that $f(j_1, j_2, r, \tau, \kappa, \zeta)$ is smooth.

5.4. **Surjectivity and injectivity.**

Proposition 5.5. *The gluing map in Lemma 5.4 is surjective and injective in the sense of the Gromov-Uhlenbeck convergence.*

Proof. The injectivity follows immediately from the implicit function theorem. We prove the surjectivity. Let $\Gamma = ((\kappa, h), \Sigma_{(r)}) \in U_{b_{(r)}}$. Suppose that $\|\kappa\|_{p,\alpha} + |h|_{C^1(\mathfrak{D}(R_0))} \leq \hbar_2$. By the same argument of Lemma 3.2 we conclude that (κ, h) satisfies (57) when $\hbar_2$ small. Then there exists a unique $(\kappa', \zeta) \in Ker\ D\mathcal{S}_b$ such that

$$(\kappa, h) = I_r(\kappa', \zeta) + Q_{b_{(r)}} \circ f_{(r)} \circ I_r(\kappa', \zeta)).$$

The surjectivity follows. □

6. **Estimates of differentiations for gluing parameters**

Let $\alpha << \mathfrak{c}$ be a constant. In this section we prove Theorem 1.1, which is the key theorem of this paper.

6.1. **Estimates of $\frac{\partial Q_{b_{(r)}}}{\partial r}$.** First we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose that D is surjective. Denote by Q a bounded right inverse of D. Let $h = Q\eta$ be a solution of $Dh = \eta$ over the finite tube $(0, 2lr) \times S^1$. Then for any $0 < \alpha < \frac{\mathfrak{c}}{2}$, there exists a constant $\mathcal{C}_7 > 0$ such that for any $1 < A < \frac{lr}{2}$,*

$$\left\| h \mid_{\frac{lr}{2} \le s \le \frac{3lr}{2}} \right\|_{1,p,\alpha} \le \mathcal{C}_7 \left[\left(e^{-\alpha A} + e^{-\mathfrak{c}(\frac{lr}{2} - A)} \right) \|\eta\|_{p,\alpha} + \left\| \eta \mid_{\frac{lr}{2} - A \le s \le \frac{3lr}{2} + A} \right\|_{p,\alpha} \right]. \tag{61}$$

Proof. Denote by χ the restriction of $\eta - Sh$ to the part $\frac{lr}{2} - A \le s \le \frac{3lr}{2} + A$. It is well known that $\bar{\partial}_{J_0} : W^{1,p,\alpha} \to L^{p,\alpha}$ has a bounded right inverse, denoted by Q_{J_0}. Let $\hat{h} = Q_{J_0}\chi$. Then

$$\bar{\partial}_{J_0}(h - \hat{h}) = 0, \qquad \tfrac{lr}{2} - A \le s \le \tfrac{3lr}{2} + A.$$

Since

$$\|\chi\|_{p,\alpha} \le \left\| \eta \mid_{\frac{lr}{2} - A \le s \le \frac{3lr}{2} + A} \right\|_{p,\alpha} + C_1 e^{-\mathfrak{c}(\frac{lr}{2} - A)} \|h\|_{p,\alpha} \le \left\| \eta \mid_{\frac{lr}{2} - A \le s \le \frac{3lr}{2} + A} \right\|_{p,\alpha} + C_2 e^{-\mathfrak{c}(\frac{lr}{2} - A)} \|\eta\|_{p,\alpha}$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$, we get

$$\|\hat{h}\|_{1,p,\alpha} = \|Q_{J_0}\chi\|_{1,p,\alpha} \le C_3 \left(\left\| \eta \mid_{\frac{lr}{2} - A \le s \le \frac{3lr}{2} + A} \right\|_{p,\alpha} + e^{-\mathfrak{c}(\frac{lr}{2} - A)} \|\eta\|_{p,\alpha} \right)$$

for some constant $C_3 > 0$. By (19) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| h \mid_{\frac{lr}{2} \le s \le \frac{3lr}{2}} \right\|_{1,p,\alpha} \le \left\| (h - \hat{h}) \mid_{\frac{lr}{2} \le s \le \frac{3lr}{2}} \right\|_{1,p,\alpha} + \|\hat{h}\|_{1,p,\alpha} \\ &\le C_4 \left(e^{-\alpha A} \left\| (h - \hat{h}) \mid_{\frac{lr}{2} - A \le s \le \frac{3lr}{2} + A} \right\|_{2,\alpha} + \left\| \eta \mid_{\frac{lr}{2} - A \le s \le \frac{3lr}{2} + A} \right\|_{p,\alpha} + e^{-\mathfrak{c}(\frac{lr}{2} - A)} \|\eta\|_{p,\alpha} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_4 > 0$. Then the corollary follows from

$$\|h - \hat{h}\|_{2,\alpha} \le C_5 \left(\|h\|_{p,\alpha} + \|\hat{h}\|_{p,\alpha} \right) \le C_6 \|\eta\|_{p,\alpha},$$

for some constant $C_6 > 0$. ☐

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose that $D\mathcal{S}_b|_{K_b \times W^{1,p,\alpha}} : K_b \times W^{1,p,\alpha} \to L^{p,\alpha}$ is surjective. Denote by $Q_b : L^{p,\alpha} \to K_b \times W^{1,p,\alpha}$ a right inverse of $D\mathcal{S}_b$. Let $Q_{b_{(r)}}$ be an right inverse of $D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$ defined in* (39). *Then there exists a constant $\mathcal{C}_8 > 0$, independent of r, such that*

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} Q_{b_{(r)}} \right\| \le \mathcal{C}_8 \tag{62}$$

and

$$\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(Q_{b_{(r)}} \eta_r \right) \right\|_{1,p,\alpha,r} \le \mathcal{C}_8 \left[\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \eta_r \right\|_{p,\alpha,r} + \frac{1}{r} \left\| \eta_r \mid_{\frac{lr}{4} \le |s_i| \le \frac{7lr}{4}} \right\|_{p,\alpha,r} + e^{-\alpha \frac{lr}{8}} \|\eta_r\|_{p,\alpha,r} \right] \tag{63}$$

for any $\eta_r \in L^{2,\alpha}_r$.

Proof. The proof of (62) is easy. In the following we prove (63). Given $\eta_r \in L^{2,\alpha}_r$, denote $\tilde{\eta}_r = (D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \circ Q'_{b_{(r)}})^{-1}\eta_r$, we have a pair $(\tilde{\eta}_1, \tilde{\eta}_2)$, where $\tilde{\eta}_1 = \beta_1 \tilde{\eta}_r,\ \tilde{\eta}_2 = \beta_2 \tilde{\eta}_r$. Set

$$Q_b(\tilde{\eta}_1, \tilde{\eta}_2) = (\tilde{\kappa}_b, \tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2), \quad \tilde{h}_{(r)} = \tilde{h}_1 \beta_1 + \tilde{h}_2 \beta_2.$$

Then $Q_{b_{(r)}} \eta_r = Q'_{b_{(r)}} \tilde{\eta}_r = (\tilde{\kappa}_b, \tilde{h}_{(r)})$. So

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(Q_{b_{(r)}} \eta_r \right) \mid_{|s_i| \le \frac{lr}{2}} = \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{\kappa}_b}{\partial r}, \sum \frac{\partial \tilde{h}_i}{\partial r} \beta_i + \sum \tilde{h}_i \frac{\partial \beta_i}{\partial r} \right) \mid_{|s_i| \le \frac{lr}{2}} = Q_b \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \tilde{\eta}_1, \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \tilde{\eta}_2 \right) \mid_{|s_i| \le \frac{lr}{2}},$$

where we used $\beta_i \mid_{|s_i|\le \frac{lr}{2}}= 1$. As $\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\tilde{\eta}_i = \beta_i \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\tilde{\eta}_r + \frac{\partial \beta_i}{\partial r}\tilde{\eta}_r$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\left(\tfrac{\partial \tilde{\kappa}}{\partial r}, \tfrac{\partial \tilde{h}_1}{\partial r}, \tfrac{\partial \tilde{h}_2}{\partial r}\right)\right\|_{1,p,\alpha} &= \left\|Q_b\left(\tfrac{\partial \tilde{\eta}_1}{\partial r}, \tfrac{\partial \tilde{\eta}_2}{\partial r}\right)\right\|_{1,p,\alpha} \\ &\le C_1\left\|\tfrac{\partial \tilde{\eta}_r}{\partial r}\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} + \frac{C_1}{r}\left\|\tilde{\eta}_r \mid_{\frac{lr}{2}\le|s_i|\le\frac{3lr}{2}}\right\|_{p,\alpha,r}.\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

In the following we calculate $\left\|\frac{\partial \tilde{\eta}_r}{\partial r}\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} + \frac{1}{r}\left\|\tilde{\eta}_r \mid_{\frac{lr}{2}\le|s_i|\le\frac{3lr}{2}}\right\|_{p,\alpha,r}$. By the same calculation as (43) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_r - \tilde{\eta}_r &= D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \circ Q'_{b_{(r)}}\tilde{\eta}_r - (\beta_1^2+\beta_2^2)\tilde{\eta}_r = \kappa_{b_{(r)}} + D_{u_{(r)}}\tilde{h}_{(r)} - (\beta_1^2+\beta_2^2)\tilde{\eta}_r \\ &= \sum(\bar{\partial}\beta_i)\tilde{h}_i + \sum \beta_i(S_{u_{(r)}} - S_{u_i})\tilde{h}_i.\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

By the exponential decay $S_{u_{(r)}}, S_{u_i}$ and

$$\bar{\partial}\beta_i|_{|s_i|\le\frac{lr}{2}} = 0, \quad |\bar{\partial}\beta_i| \le \tfrac{4}{lr}, \quad S_{u_{(r)}}|_{|s_i|\le\frac{lr}{2}} = S_{u_i}|_{|s_i|\le\frac{lr}{2}}, \tag{66}$$

we conclude from (65) that

$$\left\|\tilde{\eta}_r \mid_{\frac{lr}{4}\le|s_i|\le\frac{7lr}{4}}\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} \le \left\|\eta_r \mid_{\frac{lr}{4}\le|s_i|\le\frac{7lr}{4}}\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} + \tfrac{C_2}{r}\sum\left\|\tilde{h}_i \mid_{\frac{lr}{2}\le|s_i|\le\frac{3lr}{2}}\right\|_{1,p,\alpha}. \tag{67}$$

Taking the derivative of (65), by the exponential decay of $S_{u_{(r)}}, S_{u_i}$, and $|\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\bar{\partial}\beta_i| \le \frac{C}{l^2r^2}$ for some constant $C > 0$, we have

$$\left\|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial r}\tilde{\eta}_r\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} \le \left\|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial r}\eta_r\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} + \tfrac{C_4}{r^2}\sum\left\|\tilde{h}_i \mid_{\frac{lr}{2}\le|s_i|\le\frac{3lr}{2}}\right\|_{1,p,\alpha} + \tfrac{C_4}{r}\sum\left\|\tfrac{\partial \tilde{h}_i}{\partial r} \mid_{\frac{lr}{2}\le|s_i|\le\frac{3lr}{2}}\right\|_{1,p,\alpha}. \tag{68}$$

Applying (64) and Lemma 6.1 with $A = \frac{lr}{4}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&C_1\left\|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial r}\tilde{\eta}_r\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} + \tfrac{C_1}{r}\left\|\tilde{\eta}_r \mid_{\frac{lr}{4}\le|s_i|\le\frac{7lr}{4}}\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} \\ &\le C_6\left[\left\|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial r}\eta_r\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} + \tfrac{1}{r}\left\|\eta_r \mid_{\frac{lr}{4}\le|s_i|\le\frac{7lr}{4}}\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} + e^{-\alpha\frac{lr}{4}}\|\eta_r\|_{p,\alpha}\right],\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

where we use $\mathfrak{c} > \alpha$. Then

$$\left\|\left(\tfrac{\partial \kappa}{\partial r}, \tfrac{\partial \tilde{h}_1}{\partial r}, \tfrac{\partial \tilde{h}_2}{\partial r}\right)\right\|_{1,p,\alpha} \le C_6\left[\left\|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial r}\eta_r\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} + \tfrac{1}{r}\|\eta_r \mid_{\frac{lr}{4}\le|s_i|\le\frac{7lr}{4}}\|_{1,p,\alpha} + e^{-\alpha\frac{lr}{4}}\|\eta_r\|_{p,\alpha}\right]. \tag{70}$$

Applying Lemma 6.1 with $A = \frac{lr}{8}$ again and using (67) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum\left\|\tilde{h}_i \mid_{\frac{lr}{2}\le|s_i|\le\frac{3lr}{2}}\right\|_{1,p,\alpha} &\le C_7\left(e^{-\alpha\frac{lr}{8}}\|\tilde{\eta}\|_{1,p,\alpha} + \|\tilde{\eta} \mid_{\frac{3lr}{8}\le|s_i|\le\frac{13lr}{8}}\|_{p,\alpha}\right) \\ &\le C_8\left(e^{-\alpha\frac{lr}{8}}\|\eta\|_{1,p,\alpha} + \|\eta \mid_{\frac{lr}{4}\le|s_i|\le\frac{7lr}{4}}\|_{p,\alpha} + \sum\tfrac{1}{r}\left\|\tilde{h}_i \mid_{\frac{lr}{2}\le|s_i|\le\frac{3lr}{2}}\right\|_{1,p,\alpha}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

Note that $\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(Q_{b_{(r)}}\eta_r\right) = \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{\kappa}_b}{\partial r}, \sum \frac{\partial \tilde{h}_i}{\partial r}\beta_i + \sum \tilde{h}_i\frac{\partial \beta_i}{\partial r}\right)$. Then (63) follows from (70) and (71). □

6.2. Estimates of $\frac{\partial I_{(r)}}{\partial r}$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let* $I_r : KerD\mathcal{S}_b \longrightarrow KerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$ *be an isomorphisms defined in* (47)*. Then there exists a constant* $\mathcal{C}_9 > 0,$ *independent of* $r,$ *such that*

$$\left\| \tfrac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(I_r(\kappa, h, h_0) \right) \right\|_{1,p,\alpha,r} \leq \tfrac{\mathcal{C}_9}{r} \| (\kappa, h) \mid_{\frac{lr}{2} \leq |s_i| \leq \frac{3lr}{2}} \|_{1,p,\alpha} \leq \tfrac{\mathcal{C}_9}{r} e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{2}} \| (\kappa, h) \|_{1,p,\alpha}, \tag{72}$$

for any $(\kappa, h, h_0) \in KerD\mathcal{S}_b$*.*

Proof. By definition of $I_r,$ we have

$$\tfrac{\partial}{\partial r} I_r(\kappa, h, h_0) = \left(0, \tfrac{\partial h_{(r)}}{\partial r} \right) + \tfrac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(Q_{b_{(r)}} \right) D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}(\kappa, h_{(r)}) + Q_{b_{(r)}} \tfrac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}(\kappa, h_{(r)}) \right).$$

Note that $\frac{\partial}{\partial r} h_{(r)} = \sum \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \beta_i h_i$. A direct calculation gives us

$$D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}(\kappa, h_{(r)}) = (\bar{\partial}\beta_1) h_1 + \beta_1 (S_{u_{(r)}} - S_{u_1}) h_1 + (\bar{\partial}\beta_2) h_2 + \beta_2 (S_{u_{(r)}} - S_{u_2}) h_2. \tag{73}$$

By (66) we have $supp\ D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}(\kappa, h_{(r)}) \subset \{ \frac{lr}{2} \leq |s_i| \leq \frac{3lr}{2} \}$. Since

$$\left(|S_{u_{(r)}}| + |S_u| \right) \mid_{\frac{lr}{2} \leq |s_i| \leq \frac{3lr}{2}} \leq C e^{-\mathfrak{c}\frac{lr}{2}},$$

the lemma follows from $\|Q_{b_{(r)}}\| \leq \mathcal{C}_2,$ $\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial r} Q_{b_{(r)}} \right\| \leq \mathcal{C}_8.$ ☐

6.3. Estimates of $\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left\lfloor I_r(\kappa, \zeta) + Q_{b(r)} f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa, \zeta)) \right\rfloor$.

From the Implicity function Theorem we have

$$\| f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa, \zeta)) \|_{p,\alpha,r} \leq C(\| (\kappa, \zeta) \|_{1,p,\alpha} + \| \bar{\partial}_J u_{(r)} \|). \tag{74}$$

For any small $(\kappa, \zeta) \in kerD\mathcal{S}_b$, $\exp_{u_i} \zeta$ converges to a point as $|s_i| \to \infty$. It follows that $S_{\exp_{u_i} \zeta}$ converges to zero exponentially. Since $(\kappa, h_{(r)})$ satisfies (77) with $\kappa|_{|s_1| \geq \frac{lr}{2}} = 0$, by (89) and (91) we conclude that in the part $\frac{lr}{2} \leq |s_i| \leq \frac{3lr}{2}$

$$|S_{\exp_{u_{(r)}} h_{(r)}}| \leq C_1 e^{-\mathfrak{c}\frac{lr}{2}}, \quad |S_{u_{(r)}}| \leq C_1 e^{-\mathfrak{c}\frac{lr}{2}} \tag{75}$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$, when $r > 4R_0$.

Without loss of generality, we will fix a complex structure (j_1, j_2) to simplify notations. We write

$$I_r(\kappa, \zeta) + Q_{b(r)} \circ f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa, \zeta)) = (\kappa_r, h_{(r)}) \tag{76}$$

where $\kappa_r \in K_{b(r)}, h_{(r)} \in C^\infty(\Sigma; u_{(r)}^\star TM)$. Denote $v = \exp_{u_{(r)}} h_{(r)}$. We have

$$\bar{\partial}_J \exp_{u_{(r)}} h_{(r)} + \kappa_r' = 0, \ \ where \ \ \kappa_r' = P_{u_{(r)},v} \kappa_r. \tag{77}$$

Put

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \exp_{u_{(r)}} h_{(r)} = G, \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(P_{u_{(r)},v} \kappa_r \right) = \Psi.$$

G can be written as

$$G = P_{u_{(r)},v} \tfrac{\partial u_{(r)}}{\partial r} + E_{u_{(r)}}(h_{(r)}) \tfrac{\partial h_{(r)}}{\partial r}. \tag{78}$$

Here $E_{u_{(r)}}(h_{(r)})$ defined in (29). Taking differentiation of (77) with respect to r we get

$$D_v G + \Psi = 0. \tag{79}$$

We may write (79) as

$$P_{v,u_{(r)}} \left(D\mathcal{S}_{(\kappa_r',v)}(\Psi, G) \right) - D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(\kappa_r, h_{(r)} \right) \right) \tag{80}$$

$$+D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\kappa_r, h_{(r)}\right)\right)=0.$$

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\delta > 0$ be a constant such that $4\delta\mathcal{C}_8 \leq 1$ where $\mathcal{C}_8$ is the constant in Lemma 6.2. Then there are two constants $0 < \hbar_5 < \hbar_4$ and $R_1 > R_0$ depending only on δ, α, j and the geometry of M, such that for any $r > R_1$ and $\|(\kappa, \zeta)\| \leq \hbar_5$, we have*

$$\left\|P_{v,u_{(r)}}\left(D\mathcal{S}_{(\kappa_r,v)}(\Psi, G)\right)-D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\kappa_r, h_{(r)}\right)\right)\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} \leq \delta\left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\kappa_r, h_{(r)}\right)\right\|_{1,p,\alpha,r}+\mathcal{C}_{10}e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{2}}, \tag{81}$$

for some constant $\mathcal{C}_{10} > 0$ depending only on $\hbar_5$, R_1 and the geometry of M. Here $\hbar_4$ is the constant in Lemma 5.4.

Proof. By (78)

$$\left\|P_{v,u_{(r)}}\left(D\mathcal{S}_{(\kappa_r',v)}(\Psi, G)\right)-D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\left(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\kappa_r, h_{(r)}\right)\right)\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} \leq (I)+(II)+(III), \tag{82}$$

where

$$(I)=\left\|P_{v,u_{(r)}}D_vE_{u_{(r)}}(h_{(r)})\tfrac{\partial h_{(r)}}{\partial r}-D_{u_{(r)}}\tfrac{\partial h_{(r)}}{\partial r}\right\|_{p,\alpha,r},$$

$$(II)=\left\|P_{v,u_{(r)}}D_vP_{u_{(r)},v}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}u_{(r)}\right\|_{p,\alpha,r}, \quad (III)=\left\|P_{v,u_{(r)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(P_{u_{(r)},v}\kappa_r)-\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\kappa_r\right\|_{p,\alpha,r}.$$

We calculate (I). There is a constant $C_1 > 0$ depending only on the geometry of M such that

$$(I) \leq C_1\|h_{(r)}\|_{1,p,\alpha,r}\left\|\tfrac{\partial h_{(r)}}{\partial r}\right\|_{1,p,\alpha,r}. \tag{83}$$

Essentially, this estimate has been obtained by McDuff and D. Salamon (see (3.5.5), P68, [13]) we omit the proof here.

Now we calculate (II). It follows from the definition of $u_{(r)}$ that $supp\left(\frac{\partial u_{(r)}}{\partial r}\right) \subset \{\frac{lr}{2} \leq |s_i| \leq \frac{3lr}{2}\}$. By Theorem 2.1 and a direct integration we get

$$\left|\tfrac{\partial u_{(r)}}{\partial r}\right|+\left|\nabla\left(\tfrac{\partial u_{(r)}}{\partial r}\right)\right| \leq C_2e^{-\mathfrak{c}|s_i|}, \quad \forall\tfrac{lr}{2} \leq |s_i| \leq lr,$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$. Hence there exists a constant $C_3 > 0$ such that

$$(II) \leq C_3e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{2}}. \tag{84}$$

Finally we estimate (III).

$$\begin{aligned}(III)=\left\|P_{v,u_{(r)}}\frac{\partial P_{u_{(r)},v}}{\partial r}\kappa_r\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} &\leq C_4\left\|\frac{\partial u_{(r)}}{\partial r}\kappa_r\right\|_{p,\alpha,r}+C_4\left\|\kappa_r\frac{\partial h_{(r)}}{\partial r}\right\|_{p,\alpha,r}\\ &\leq C_5e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{2}}+C_5\|\kappa_{(r)}\|_{p,\alpha}\left\|\frac{\partial h_{(r)}}{\partial r}\right\|_{1,p,\alpha},\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

for some constants $C_4, C_5 > 0$. Inserting (83), (84) and (85) into (82), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|P_{v,u_{(r)}}\left(D\mathcal{S}_{(\kappa_r',v)}(\Psi, G)\right)-D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\left(\tfrac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\kappa_r, h_{(r)}\right)\right)\right\|_{p,\alpha,r}\\ \leq &C_6e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{2}}+C_7\left(e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{2}}+\|(\kappa_{(r)}, h_{(r)})\|_{1,p,\alpha}\right)\left\|\frac{\partial h_{(r)}}{\partial r}\right\|_{1,p,\alpha}.\end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

By (76) and (36) we have

$$\|(\kappa_{(r)}, h_{(r)})\|_{1,p,\alpha} \leq C_8(\|(\kappa, \zeta)\|_{1,p,\alpha}+e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{2}}).$$

Choose $\hbar_5$ small and R_1 big such that

$$C_7(C_8+1)(\hbar_4 + e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lR_1}{2}}) \le \delta.$$

Then the lemma follows. $\square$

Next we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6.5. *Let* $(\kappa,\zeta)\in kerD\mathcal{S}_b$ *with* $\|(\kappa,\zeta)\|\le\hbar_5$, *where* $\hbar_5$ *is the constant in Lemma 6.4. Then there exists a positive constants* $\mathcal{C}_{11}$ *such that*

$$\left\|f_r\circ I_r(\kappa,\zeta)|_{\frac{lr}{4}\le|s_i|\le\frac{7lr}{4}}\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} \le \mathcal{C}_{11}e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{4}}, \quad \forall\ \tfrac{lr}{8}\ge R_0. \tag{87}$$

Proof. From (76) and $\kappa|_{|s_i|\ge R_0}=0$ we have

$$f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa,\zeta)) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s}+J_0\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right)h_{(r)} + S_{u_{(r)}}h_{(r)}, \qquad \bar\partial_J\exp_{u_{(r)}}h_{(r)}=0, \tag{88}$$

for any $|s_i|\ge R_0$. We denote $v=\exp_{u_{(r)}}(h_{(r)})$. By Theorem 2.1 and the definition of $u_{(r)}$ we have for any $\frac{lr}{4}\le|s_i|\le lr$

$$\left|\nabla(u_{(r)})\right|\le\mathcal{C}_1e^{-\mathfrak{c}|s_i|}. \tag{89}$$

Since $\|(\kappa,h_{(r)})\|\le C_1\hbar_4$ and $\kappa|_{|s_i|\ge R_0}=0$ for some constant $C_1>0$, we have

$$\left\|h_{(r)}|_{|s_i|\ge R_0}\right\|_{1,p,\alpha}\le C_1\hbar_4. \tag{90}$$

Then we have

$$E(v;|s_i|\ge R_0)\le\hbar_0,$$

when $\hbar_4$ small. By Theorem 2.1 we have for any $\frac{lr}{4}\le|s_i|\le lr$

$$|\nabla v|\le\mathcal{C}_1e^{-\mathfrak{c}|s_i|}. \tag{91}$$

Since $\nabla v=P_{u_{(r)},v}(\nabla u_{(r)})+E_{u_{(r)}}(h_{(r)})(\nabla h_{(r)})$, (89), and (91) gives us

$$\left|E_{u_{(r)}}(h_{(r)})\nabla h_{(r)}|_{\frac{lr}{4}\le|s_i|\le lr}\right|\le C_2e^{-\mathfrak{c}|s_i|} \tag{92}$$

for some constant $C_2>0$. Note that $E_{u_{(r)}}(h_{(r)})^{-1}$ is uniform bounded as $\|h_{(r)}\|_{1,p,\alpha,r}$ small. Then

$$\left\|\nabla h_{(r)}|_{\frac{lr}{4}\le|s_i|\le\frac{7lr}{4}}\right\|_{p,\alpha}\le C_3e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{4}}, \tag{93}$$

for some constant $C_3>0$. The lemma follows from (88), (93) and the exponential decay of $S_{u_{(r)}}$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. From (76) we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(\kappa_r,h_{(r)})=\frac{\partial}{\partial r}I_r(\kappa,\zeta)+\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(Q_{b_{(r)}}\right)\circ f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa,\zeta))+\left(Q_{b_{(r)}}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa,\zeta)))\right). \tag{94}$$

Then

$$D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(\kappa_r,h_{(r)})\right)=D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}I_r(\kappa,\zeta)\right)+D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(Q_{b_{(r)}})f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa,\zeta))\right)$$
$$+\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa,\zeta))).$$

It follows together with (81) that

$$\left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa,\zeta)))\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} \leq \delta\left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(\kappa_r,h_{(r)})\right\|_{1,p,\alpha,r} + \mathcal{C}_{10}e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{2}} + (A) + (B), \tag{95}$$

where

$$(A) = \left\|D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}I_r(\kappa,\zeta)\right)\right\|_{p,\alpha,r}, \quad (B) = \left\|D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\circ\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(Q_{b_{(r)}})\circ f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa,\zeta))\right\|_{p,\alpha,r}.$$

We estimate (A). For any (κ_1,h_1), we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\right)(\kappa_1,h_1) = \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(D_{u_{(r)}}h_1+\kappa_1\right) = \frac{\partial S_{u_{(r)}}}{\partial r}h_1 = \left(0,\frac{\partial S_{u_{(r)}}}{\partial r}\right)\cdot(\kappa_1,h_1).$$

Then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\right) = \left(0,\frac{\partial S_{u_{(r)}}}{\partial r}\right) \tag{96}$$

As $I_r(\kappa,\zeta)\in kerD\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}$ we have

$$D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\circ I_r(\kappa,\zeta)=0.$$

Then

$$D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}I_r(\kappa,\zeta)\right) + \left(0,\frac{\partial S_{u_{(r)}}}{\partial r}\right)I_r(\kappa,\zeta)=0.$$

Since $\frac{\partial S_{u_{(r)}}}{\partial r}$ supports in the part $\frac{lr}{2}\leq|s_i|\leq\frac{3lr}{2}$, by the exponential decay of S_{u_i} we get

$$(A)\leq C_2e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{2}}\|(\kappa,\zeta)\|_{1,p,\alpha} \tag{97}$$

for some constant $C_2>0$. Next we estimate (B). Taking the differentiation of the equality

$$D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\circ Q_{b_{(r)}} = I$$

we get

$$D\mathcal{S}_{b_{(r)}}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(Q_{b_{(r)}})\right) = -\left(0,\frac{\partial S_{u_{(r)}}}{\partial r}\right)\cdot Q_{b_{(r)}}.$$

Together with (74) and (75) we get

$$(B)\leq C_3e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{2}} \tag{98}$$

for some constant $C_3>0$. Inserting the estimates of (A) and (B) into (95) we have

$$\left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa,\zeta)))\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} \leq C_4e^{-(\mathfrak{c}-\alpha)\frac{lr}{8}} + \delta\left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\kappa_r,h_{(r)}\right)\right\|_{1,p,\alpha,r} \tag{99}$$

for some constant $C_4>0$. As

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(\kappa_r,h_{(r)}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial r}I_r(\kappa,\zeta) + \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(Q_{b_{(r)}}\circ f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa,\zeta))\right),$$

applying (63) with $\eta=f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa,\zeta))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\kappa_r,h_{(r)}\right)\right\|_{1,p,\alpha,r} &\leq \left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial r}I_r(\kappa,\zeta)\right\| + \mathcal{C}_8\left[e^{-\alpha\frac{lr}{8}} + + \left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(f_{(r)}(I_r(\kappa,\zeta))\right)\right\|_{1,p,\alpha,r}\right] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{C}_8\left\|f_r\circ I_r(\kappa,\zeta)\mid_{\frac{lr}{4}\leq|s_i|\leq\frac{7lr}{4}}\right\|_{p,\alpha,r} \\ &\leq C_5e^{-\alpha\frac{lr}{8}} + \mathcal{C}_8\delta\left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\kappa_r,h_{(r)}\right)\right\|_{1,p,\alpha,r}\end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

for some constant $C_5 > 0$, where we used (72), (87) and (99) in last inequality. Then [1] follows from $4\mathcal{C}_8\delta < 1$ and (100). By Sobolev embedding theorem we get [2]. The Theorem 1.1 is proved. □

7. **Gromov-Witten invariants**

Proposition 7.1. *The top strata of U_I is a smooth virtual manifold.*

The proof is standard, we omit it here.

From section §4.2 we have a finite dimensional virtual orbifold system $\{U_I, E_I, \sigma_I\}$ and a finite dimensional virtual orbifold $\{U_I\}$ indexed by a partially ordered set $(\mathcal{I} = 2^{\{1,2,\cdots,N\}}, \subset)$. By Theorem 4.4 $\{U_{I,\epsilon}(M)\}$ is a compact virtual manifold. It is well-known that $\{U_{I,\epsilon}(M)\}$ is oriented.

Let $\Lambda = \{\Lambda_I\}$ be a partition of unity and $\{\Theta_I\}$ be a virtual Euler form of $\{E_I\}$ such that $\Lambda_I\Theta_I$ is compactly supported in $U_{I,\epsilon}$ (see [4, 3]). Recall that we have a natural maps

$$e_i : U_{I,\epsilon} \longrightarrow M$$

$$(\kappa, (u; \Sigma, \mathbf{y})) \longrightarrow u(y_i)$$

for $i \leq m$ defined by evaluating at marked points. The Gromov-Witten invariants can be defined as

$$\Psi_{A,g,m}(\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_m) = \sum_I \int_{U_{I,\epsilon}} \prod_i e_i^*\alpha_i \wedge \Lambda_I\Theta_I. \tag{101}$$

for $\alpha_i \in H^*(M, \mathbb{R})$ represented by differential form. Clearly, $\Psi = 0$ if $\sum \deg(\alpha_i) \neq Ind$.

It is proved that these integrals are independent of the choices of Θ_I and the regularization (see [4]). We must prove the convergence of the integrals (101) near each lower strata.

Let $\alpha \in H^*(M, \mathbb{R})$ represented by differential form. We may write

$$\prod_i e_i^*\alpha_i \wedge \Lambda_I\Theta = y(r, \tau, \xi, j)dr \wedge d\tau \wedge d\xi \wedge dj,$$

where $d\xi$ and dj denote the volume forms of $ker D\mathcal{S}_b$ and the space of complex structures respectively and y is a function. Then (**??**) and Corollary 1.2 implies that $|y| \leq C_1e^{-C_2r}$ for some constants $C_1 > 0, C_2 > 0$. Then the convergence of the integral (101) follows.

REFERENCES

[1] K. Behrend, *Gromov-Witten invariants in algebraic geometry.* Invent. Math. 127(3), 601-617, 1997.

[2] B. Chen, A. Li and B. Wang, Virtual neighborhood technique for pseudo-holomorphic spheres, arXiv:1306.3276.

[3] B. Chen, A. Li and B. Wang, Gluing principle for orbifold stratified spaces,arXiv:1502.05103.

[4] B. Chen and G. Tian, Virtual manifolds and Localization, Acta Math. Sinica, 2010(26),1-24.

[5] S. K, Donaldson, Floer homology groups in Yang-Mills theory. With the assistance of M. Furuta and D. Kotschick. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, 147. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002. viii+236 pp.

[6] K. Fukaya, Morse homotopy and its quantization, Geometry topology (Athens,GA,1993), 409-440 AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math,.2.1.

[7] K. Fukaya, Morse homotopy, A^∞ category, and Floer homologies, Proceedings of GARC workshop on geometry and topology 93(Seoul, 1993), 1-102, Lecture Notes Ser. 18.

[8] K. Fukaya and K. Ono, Arnold conjecture and Gromov-Witten invariants, Topology 38,1999,933-1048.

[9] M. Gromov, Pseudo holomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds, Invent. math., 82 (1985), 307-347.

[10] A-M. Li and Y. Ruan, Symplectic surgery and Gromov-Witten invariants of Calabi-Yau 3- folds, Invent. Math. 145, 151-218(2001)

[11] J. Li and G. Tian, Virtual moduli cycles and Gromov-Witten invariants of algebraic varieties. J. Amer. Math. Soc., 11(1), 119-174,1998.

[12] G. Liu and G. Tian, Floer homologyand Arnold conjecture. J. Differential Geom. 49 (1998), no. 1, 1-74.

[13] D. McDuff and D. Salamon, J-holomorphic curves and quantum cohomology, University Lec. Series, vol. 6, AMS.

[14] Y. Ruan, Topological Sigma model and Donaldson type invariants in Gromov theory, Math. Duke J. 83(1996), 461-500.

[15] Y. Ruan, Surgery, quantum cohomology and birational geometry, Northern California Symplectic Geometry Seminar, 183-198, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, 196.

[16] Y. Ruan, Virtual neighborhoods and pseudo-holomorphic curves, Turkish Jour. of Math. 1(1999), 161-231.

[17] Y. Ruan, G. Tian, A mathematical theory of quantum cohomology. J. Differential Geom. 42 (1995), no. 2, 259-367.

[18] Y. Ruan, G. Tian, Higher genus symplectic invariants and sigma models coupled with gravity. Invent. Math. 130 (1997), no. 3, 455-516.

[19] B. Siebert, Gromov-Witten invariants for general symplectic manifolds, arXiv:9608005

[20] B. Siebert and G. Tian, On quantum cohomology rings of Fano manifolds and a formula of Vafa and Intriligator, Asian J. Math. 1(1997), no.4, 679-695.

[21] S. Lang, Real analysis, second edition,S Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Advanced Book Program, Reading, MA, 1983. xv+533 pp.

E-mail address: `anminliscu@126.com`

E-mail address: `lshengscu@gmail.com`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SICHUAN UNIVERSITY CHENGDU, PRC